arXiv:math/0408141v3 [math.NT] 29 May 2009

ON THE BEHAVIOUR OF ROOT NUMBERS IN FAMILIES OF ELLIPTIC CURVES

H. A. HELFGOTT

Abstract. Let $\mathscr{E}$ be a one-parameter family of elliptic curves over $\mathbb{Q}$. We prove that the average root number is zero for a large class of families of elliptic curves of fairly general type. Furthermore, we show that any family $\mathscr{E}$ with at least one point of multiplicative reduction over $\mathbb{Q}(T)$ has average root number 0, provided that two classical arithmetical conjectures hold for two polynomials constructed explicitly in terms of $\mathscr{E}$. The behaviour of the root number in any family $\mathscr{E}$ without multiplicative reduction over $\mathbb{Q}(T)$ is shown to be rather regular and non-random; we give expressions for the average root number in this case.

Contents

1. Introduction 1
2. Overview 3
3. Notation 7
4. Local root numbers 8
5. Reciprocity and polynomials 13
6. The shape of the global root number 23
7. The distribution of the global root number 31
Appendix A. Rates of convergence 49
Appendix B. A non-constant family with non-zero average root number over $\mathbb{Q}$ 50
Appendix C. Two-parameter families 62
References 64

1. Introduction

The precise statement of the main results (listed and discussed in §2.3) requires a non-trivial amount of definitions and notation. Let us first discuss problems and results informally.

1.1. **Summary of results.**

Let E be an elliptic curve over $\mathbb{Q}$. Its *root number* $W(E) = \pm 1$ is the sign of its functional equation:

$$\mathcal{N}_E^{(2-s)/2}(2\pi)^{s-2}\Gamma(2-s)L(E,2-s) = W(E)\mathcal{N}_E^{s/2}(2\pi)^{-s}\Gamma(s)L(E,s),$$

where $\mathcal{N}_E$ is the conductor of E. Given an elliptic curve[1] $\mathscr{E}$ over $\mathbb{Q}(T)$, one may ask how $W(\mathscr{E}(t))$ varies as $t \in \mathbb{Q}$ varies.

The natural expectation is that $W(\mathscr{E}(t))$ be equidistributed. We will see that this holds in a strong sense whenever $\mathscr{E}$ has at least one place of multiplicative reduction,

---

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 11G05,11G40.

Key words and phrases. Elliptic curves, root numbers.

[1] We will speak interchangeably about a family of elliptic curves over a field K and an elliptic curve over $K(T)$. In other words, we will always understand *family* to mean *family fibred over the projective line.*

provided that two standard arithmetical conjectures hold. Since the conjectures have been proved in some cases, the result is unconditional for some families. If $\mathscr{E}$ has no places of multiplicative reduction, the average of $W(\mathscr{E}(t))$ need no longer be zero; we will obtain an expression for the average as an infinite product.

If the equidistribution of $W(\mathscr{E}(t))$ were proven unconditionally for any $\mathscr{E}$ for which our results are merely conditional, a standard and currently intractable conjecture in number theory would follow. Thus, we seem to be closing the subject of the distribution of the root numbers of elliptic curves for the time being.

The behaviour of $W(\mathscr{E}(t))$ will be shown to depend strongly on the arithmetic of $\mathbb{Z}$. Consider the following examples, for which our results are unconditional:

$y^2 = x^3 - (t-1)^2 tx/48 - (t-1)^3 t/864$ has av. root number 0 for $t \in \mathbb{Z}$
$y^2 = x^3 - x/12 - (11+t)/864$ has av. root number 0 for $t \in \mathbb{Q}$
$y^2 = x^3 - x/16 - (2+7t)/864$ has av. root number 0 for $t \in \mathbb{Q}$
$y^2 = x^3 - \frac{1}{48}(2-4t+t^2)x - \frac{1}{864}(3+9t-6t^2+t^3)$ has av. root number 0 for $t \in \mathbb{Q}$
$y^2 = x(x+a)(x+b)$ has av. root number 0 for $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$.

(Here "av." stands for "average". When taking averages over $\mathbb{Q}$, we order $\mathbb{Q}$ by height; see §2.1.) We will see that the fact that the first family has average root number 0 over every arithmetic progression is equivalent to the fact that the Liouville function λ (or the Möbius function μ) averages to zero over every arithmetic progression. The remaining examples follow from (and imply) particular cases of the recently solved parity problem for degree 3 ([20], [19]; cf. [11], [16], [17]). The last example does not require the apparatus developed in the body of this paper, and will be dealt with briefly (Prop. C.2). It reduces to essentially the same problem as the second example.

Consider now the following example:

$$\mathscr{E} : y^2 = x^3 - \frac{1}{48} f_1(t) f_2(t)(f_1(t)^3 - f_2(t)^3)^2 x - \frac{1}{864}(f_1(t)^3 + f_2(t)^3)(f_1(t)^3 - f_2(t)^3)^3,$$

where $f_1(t) = -5 - 2t^2$, $f_2 = 2 + 5t^2$. We will prove (unconditionally) that $\mathscr{E}(t)$ has average root number $-0.15294\ldots$ as t varies over $\mathbb{Q}$ (B.34). Notice that the family has no points of multiplicative reduction as a curve over $\mathbb{Q}(T)$; only when this is the case can the average be non-zero over $\mathbb{Q}$. (The exclusion of all other cases is conditional on the conjectures already mentioned.)

Given any family $\mathscr{E}$ without points of multiplicative reduction over $\mathbb{Q}(T)$, we will express the average root number of $\mathscr{E}(t)$ for t varying over $\mathbb{Q}$ or $\mathbb{Z}$ as an infinite product (§7.4, (7.21) and (7.22)).

* * *

Applications. Joint work with B. Conrad and K. Conrad ([5]), stemming from the present paper, has shown that, over function fields $\mathbb{F}_q(u)$, there are families $\mathscr{E}$ with places of multiplicative reduction and constant root number. At issue is a deep difference between the arithmetic of $\mathbb{Z}$ and the arithmetic of $\mathbb{F}_q(u)$ ([4]).

If the Birch-Swinnerton-Dyer conjecture holds, then $\operatorname{rank}(\mathscr{E}(t)(K)) \geq \operatorname{rank}(\mathscr{E}(K(T))) + \frac{1}{2}(1 - W(\mathscr{E}(t))(-1)^{\operatorname{rank}(\mathscr{E}(K(T)))})$ for all but finitely many $t \in K$ (by the specialisation theorem; vd. [35], Thm. C). Thus, the average root number gives a lower bound for the rank; this fact is used in [5] to construct families with excess rank. The distribution of the root number is also crucial to issues of the distribution of the zeroes of L-functions of elliptic curves; see [24] for an application of the main result of the present paper.

1.2. **The analytical crux of the problem.**

It is well-known that there is a general expression

$$W(E) = -\prod_p W_p(E), \tag{1.1}$$

where W_p is a function defined on elliptic curves over $\mathbb{Q}_p$ (the *local root number*). However, we *cannot* conclude that

$$\mathrm{av}_{\mathbb{Z}}\, W(\mathscr{E}(n)) = -\prod_p \int_{\mathbb{Z}_p} W_p(\mathscr{E}(x))dx \qquad \textbf{(FALLACY!)} \tag{1.2}$$

where $\mathrm{av}_{\mathbb{Z}}\, f(n)$ is the average $\lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{N}\sum_{n=1}^{N} f(n)$. One simply cannot do this with infinite products. In fact, there are many cases when (1.2) is false, though a different expression for the average as a product of p-adic integrals is possible (Corollaries 7.4 and 7.5 and Propositions 7.9 and 7.10).

(Even if we did not have an infinite product, we would have to be a little careful. Consider the function $h_p : \mathbb{Q}_p \to \mathbb{C}$ given by

$$h_p(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x \notin \mathbb{Q} \\ 0 & \text{if } x \in \mathbb{Q}. \end{cases}$$

The average of $h_p(x)$ over $\mathbb{Z}$ or $\mathbb{Q}$ has to be zero, since $h_p(x)$ is identically 0 on $\mathbb{Q}$. At the same time, $\int_{\mathbb{Z}_p} h_p(x)dx = 1$, and $0 \neq 1$.)

Our main task will be to show that the infinite product $W(\mathscr{E}(t)) = -\prod_p W_p(\mathscr{E}(t))$ can be rewritten as a something close to finite product of functions that are locally constant almost everywhere, times a function of the form $\lambda(P(t))$, where λ is the well-known Liouville function and P is a polynomial. (We will actually be able to do this for all families $\mathscr{E}$ over $K(T)$, where K is any global field of characteristic $\neq 2, 3$. Only Section 7 will be specifically about $K = \mathbb{Q}$.) Once we have rewritten the root number in this fashion, we will be able to compute averages correctly.

The fact that $\mathrm{av}_{\mathbb{Z}}\, W(\mathscr{E}(n)) = 0$ in the general case will be one of our two main conditional results; it will be conditional on, and indeed shown to be equivalent to, a difficult conjecture that remains open in general, viz., that $\lambda(P(n))$, P a polynomial, averages to zero. The other main conditional result will be $\mathrm{av}_{\mathbb{Q}}\, W(\mathscr{E}(t)) = 0$ – again, in the general case; there are special families for which the average is non-zero, and we will classify them and determine their average root numbers.

Our conditional results ($\mathrm{av}_{\mathbb{Z}}\, W(\mathscr{E}(n)) = 0$, $\mathrm{av}_{\mathbb{Q}}\, W(\mathscr{E}(t)) = 0$) are unconditional when the polynomial P we must use is one of those for which the conjecture on $\lambda(P(n))$ has been proven. Some of these cases of the conjecture are due to the author ([19], [20]).

1.3. **Acknowledgements.**

The author is most grateful to H. Iwaniec for bringing the main subject of this paper to his attention in the correct belief that an analytic problem lurked under the surface. The advice of B. Conrad and K. Conrad was in general quite valuable. Thanks are also due to C. Hall, for many conversations on elliptic curves, to G. Harcos, for his advice on formalism, to S. Kobayashi, S. J. Miller, O. Rizzo and D. Rohrlich, for discussions on their work, and to X. Xarles, who pointed out errors in the appendices. The opinions of an anonymous referee also proved very useful. Some computations in the appendices were done by SAGE v3.2.1, a free open-source mathematics software system.

2. OVERVIEW

2.1. **Preliminaries.**

2.1.1. *Fields, places and polynomials.* By a *global field* we shall mean either (a) a number field, or (b) a function field over a finite field.

Let K be a global field. Given a place v of $K(T)$, we define the homogeneous polynomial $P_v = y^{\deg Q} Q_v(x/y)$ if v is given by a polynomial $Q_v \in K[t]$, and $P_v = y$ if $v = \deg(\text{den}) - \deg(\text{num})$. The choice among all Q_v for a given v is arbitrary; thus, given a finite, non-empty set V of places of K, we may assume $P_v \in \mathscr{O}_{K,V}[x,y]$.

We say that $f \in \mathscr{O}_{K,V}[x]$ (resp. $f \in \mathscr{O}_{K,V}[x,y]$) is *square-free* if there are no polynomials $f_1, f_2 \in K[x]$, $f_1 \notin K$ (resp. $f_1, f_2 \in K[x,y]$, $f_1 \notin K$) such that $f = f_1^2 \cdot f_2$.

Let $\mathscr{E}$ be an elliptic curve over $K(T)$. Define the homogeneous polynomials

$$M_{\mathscr{E}} = \prod_{\mathscr{E}\text{ has mult. red. at } v} P_v, \qquad B_{\mathscr{E}} = \prod_{\mathscr{E}\text{ has q. bad red. at } v} P_v, \tag{2.1}$$

where we say that $\mathscr{E}$ has quite bad reduction at v if every quadratic twist of $\mathscr{E}$ has bad reduction at v. Both $M_{\mathscr{E}}$ and $B_{\mathscr{E}}$ are square-free. See §6.2.1 for criteria for determining the reduction type.

2.1.2. *Averages.* We will average functions over the integers, over arithmetic progressions, over subsets of $\mathbb{Z}^2$, and over the rationals; we will order $\mathbb{Z}^2$ and the rationals by height. More precisely, we proceed as follows. Given a function $f : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{C}$ and an arithmetic progression $a + m\mathbb{Z}$, we define

$$\text{av}_{a+m\mathbb{Z}} f = \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{N/m} \sum_{\substack{1\leq n\leq N \\ n\equiv a \bmod m}} f(n). \tag{2.2}$$

If $\text{av}_{a+m\mathbb{Z}} f = 0$ for all $a \in \mathbb{Z}$, $m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, we say that f *has strong zero average over the integers.* Given a function $f : \mathbb{Z}^2 \to \mathbb{C}$, a lattice coset $a + L \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$ and a sector $S \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ (see §3.6), we define

$$\text{av}_{S\cap(a+L)} f = \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{|S \cap (a+L) \cap [-N,N]^2|} \sum_{(x,y)\in S\cap(a+L)\cap[-N,N]^2} f(x,y). \tag{2.3}$$

Here and henceforth, $|A|$ denotes the number of elements of a set A. We say that f *has strong zero average over* $\mathbb{Z}^2$ if $\text{av}_{S\cap(a+L)} f = 0$ for all choices of S and $a + L$.

Given a function $f : \mathbb{Q} \to \mathbb{Z}$, a lattice coset $a + L \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$ and a sector $S \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, we define

$$\text{av}_{\mathbb{Q},S\cap(a+L)} f = \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{\sum_{(x,y)\in S\cap(a+L)\cap[-N,N]^2,\, \gcd(x,y)=1, y\neq 0} f(x/y)}{|\{(x,y) \in S \cap (a+L) \cap [-N,N]^2 : \gcd(x,y) = 1\}|}. \tag{2.4}$$

We say that f *has strong zero average over the rationals* if $\text{av}_{\mathbb{Q},S\cap(a+L)} f = 0$ for all choices of S and $a+L$. We are making our definition of "strong zero average" strict enough for it to be invariant under fractional linear transformations. Moreover, by letting S be arbitrary, we allow sampling to be restricted to any open interval in $\mathbb{Q}$. Thus our results will not be imputable to peculiarities in averaging order or to superficial cancellation.

In all of the above averages, we allow the function f to be undefined for finitely many possible values of the variables. (If we change $f(7)$ and only $f(7)$, the average $\text{av}_{\mathbb{Z}} f(n)$ does not change; hence we may take the average of a function that is undefined at 7 and only at 7.)

We say that only a *zero proportion* of all integers n satisfy a given property $\mathbf{P}$ if $|\{1 \leq n \leq N : \mathbf{P}(n) \text{ holds}\}| = o(N)$. Similarly, we say that only a *zero proportion* of all pairs (x,y) of coprime integers satisfy a property $\mathbf{P}$ if $|\{(x,y) \in [-N,N]^2 : x, y \text{ are coprime and } \mathbf{P}(x,y) \text{ holds}\}| = o(N^2)$.

2.2. Assumptions.

By **Theorem 0.0** ($\mathfrak{X}(P)$, $\mathfrak{Y}(Q)$) we mean a theorem conditional on hypotheses $\mathfrak{X}$ and $\mathfrak{Y}$ in so far as they concern the objects P and Q, respectively. A result whose statement does not contain parentheses after the numeration should be understood to be unconditional.

Hypothesis $\mathscr{A}_1(P)$**.** *Let* $P \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ *be given. Only for a zero proportion of all integers* n *do we have a prime* $p > \sqrt{n}$ *such that* $p^2 | P(n)$*.*

Hypothesis $\mathscr{A}_2(P)$**.** *Let a homogeneous* $P \in \mathbb{Z}[x, y]$ *be given. Only for a zero proportion of all pairs of coprime integers* (x, y) *do we have a prime* $p > \max(x, y)$ *such that* $p^2 | P(x, y)$*.*

Hypotheses $\mathscr{A}_1(P)$ and $\mathscr{A}_2(P)$ are believed to hold for all square-free P. The *abc*-conjecture would imply as much ([12], Thm. 8). We know $\mathscr{A}_1(P)$ (resp. $\mathscr{A}_2(P)$) unconditionally when P has no irreducible factor of degree larger than 3 (resp. larger than 6). See [9], [10], [13]; vd. [18] for sharper bounds.

Hypothesis $\mathscr{B}_1(P)$**.** *Let* $P \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ *be given. Then* $\lambda(P(n))$ *has strong zero average over the integers.*

Hypothesis $\mathscr{B}_2(P)$**.** *Let a homogeneous* $P \in \mathbb{Z}[x, y]$ *be given. Then* $\lambda(P(x, y))$ *has strong zero average over* $\mathbb{Z}^2$*.*

(Recall the *Liouville function* $\lambda(n) = \prod_{p|n} (-1)^{v_p(n)}$.) Hypotheses $\mathscr{B}_1(P)$ and $\mathscr{B}_2(P)$ are believed to hold for all non-constant, square-free P. (This is a conjecture of Chowla's ([2], p. 96), closely related to the Bunyakovsky/Schinzel conjecture on primes represented by polynomials.) The prime number theorem implies $\mathscr{B}_1(P)$ and $\mathscr{B}_2(P)$ for $\deg P = 1$; essentially the same analytical techniques suffice to prove $\mathscr{B}_2(P)$ for $\deg P = 2$. Hypothesis $\mathscr{B}_2(P)$ has been proved ([19]) for $\deg P = 3$ by a parity-breaking approach. It has also been proved recently for $\deg P = 4$ and P the product of 4 distinct linear factors [14]; it is quite possible that a similar approach will eventually prove $\mathscr{B}_2(P)$ for $\deg P > 4$, P a product of arbitrarily many distinct linear factors.

2.3. Main results.

Main Theorem 1 ($\mathscr{A}_1(B_{\mathscr{E}}(t, 1))$, $\mathscr{B}_1(M_{\mathscr{E}}(t, 1))$)**.** *Let* $\mathscr{E}$ *be a family of elliptic curves over* $\mathbb{Q}$*. Assume that* $M_{\mathscr{E}}(t, 1)$ *is not constant. Then* $t \mapsto W(\mathscr{E}(t))$ *has strong zero average over the integers.*

Main Theorem 2 ($\mathscr{A}_2(B_{\mathscr{E}})$, $\mathscr{B}_2(M_{\mathscr{E}})$)**.** *Let* $\mathscr{E}$ *be a family of elliptic curves over* $\mathbb{Q}$*. Assume that* $M_{\mathscr{E}}$ *is not constant*[2]*. Then* $t \mapsto W(\mathscr{E}(t))$ *has strong zero average over the rationals.*

We will also be able to prove that we can go in the other direction: If $\mathscr{A}_1(B_{\mathscr{E}}(t, 1))$ (resp. $\mathscr{A}_2(B_{\mathscr{E}})$) is assumed, then $\mathscr{B}_1(M_{\mathscr{E}}(t, 1))$ (resp. $\mathscr{B}_2(M_{\mathscr{E}})$) holds if and only if $W(\mathscr{E}(t))$ has strong zero average over the integers (resp. over the rationals). Since $\mathscr{B}_1(P)$ (resp. $\mathscr{B}_2(P)$) does not hold for P constant, the case $M_{\mathscr{E}}(t, 1) = 1$ (or, respectively, $M_{\mathscr{E}} = 1$) is not covered by Main Theorem 1 (or, respectively, Main Theorem 2). In that case, we will be able to express $\mathrm{av}_{a+m\mathbb{Z}} W(\mathscr{E}(t))$ and $\mathrm{av}_{\mathbb{Q}, S \cap L} W(\mathscr{E}(t))$ as infinite products (Propositions 7.9 and 7.10).

---

[2] In other words, assume that $\mathscr{E}$ has at least one point of multiplicative reduction over $\mathbb{Q}(T)$.

2.4. **Generalisations.** Let $\mathscr{E}$ now be an elliptic curve over $K(T)$, where K is either a number field or a function field. The root number $W(\mathscr{E}(t))$ can be described in the same way whether or not $K = \mathbb{Q}$ (Thm. 6.6). Consider first the case of K a number field. The analogues of $\mathscr{A}_j(P)$ (resp. $\mathscr{B}_j(P)$) could then probably be proved for $\deg P \leq 6$ (resp. $\deg P \leq 3$), just as for $K = \mathbb{Q}$; they are certainly believed to hold in general. It is not clear what the most natural convention for averaging $W(\mathscr{E}(t))$ is, since there will usually be infinitely many elements of K of height below a given constant; Thm. 6.6 ought to yield average zero under any reasonable convention, but a fair amount of ad-hoc work would be required for any given one. Note that, for a generic number field K, the functional equation is still conjectural; the root number $W(E)$ has to be seen as defined by the product of local root numbers that is used to compute it.

Let K be a function field. Then we face a qualitatively different situation: on the one hand, $\mathscr{A}_1(P)$ and $\mathscr{A}_2(P)$ are known to hold for all square-free P ([27], [26]); on the other hand, $\mathscr{B}_1(P)$ and $\mathscr{B}_2(P)$ are false for some non-constant, square-free P ([4]). There are families $\mathscr{E}$ over $K(T)$ with $W(\mathscr{E}(t))$ constant and $M_{\mathscr{E}} \neq 1$ ([5]).

We will express the average of $W(\mathscr{E}(t))$ as an infinite product when $\mathscr{E}$ is a family without multiplicative reduction over $K(T)$, where $K = \mathbb{F}_q(u)$ and q is not a power of 2 or 3. The key intermediate result (Thm. 6.6) is valid over any global field of char. $\neq 2, 3$. Families of elliptic curves over function fields of char. 2 or 3 present technical difficulties due to the ubiquity of wild ramification.

2.5. Relation to the previous literature.

2.5.1. *Algebraic aspect.* The decomposition of the root number $W(E)$ into local root numbers is a classical result [7]. The local root numbers at places with residue field characteristic $\neq 2, 3$ were made explicit by Rohrlich ([30], [31], [32]). The case of residue field characteristic 3 was made explicit by Kobayashi ([22]); the resulting expressions are complicated enough that a similar treatment of residue field characteristic 2 is likely to be nearly unworkable. (*Note added during editing:* There is some very recent work (over number fields) due to Dokchitser and Dokchitser [8] on the case of residue field characteristic 2. There is also some unpublished work by D. Whitehouse.) Over $\mathbb{Q}$, the root numbers $W_2(E)$, $W_3(E)$ were described in lengthy tables by Halberstadt ([15]); no clear pattern is discernible. As a consequence, much work on root numbers up to now ([29], [37]) has had to involve either very substantial case-work or limitations to certain convenient congruence classes.

In §4, we will show that every local root number $W(\mathscr{E}(t))$ is locally constant almost everywhere – not a surprise – and, moreover, that it has a very regular kind of behaviour at the points t where it is not locally constant. This qualitative characterisation allows us to work with the local root numbers at all places of a number field (or of a function field of char $\neq 2, 3$) with essentially no case-work.

2.5.2. *Analytic aspect.* Starting with [30], there was a series of papers ([23], [32], [28], [29], [37]) on average root numbers in one-parameter families. The cases treated in [23], [28] and [29] all lack multiplicative reduction, and thus sometimes have a non-zero average root number, which may be computed with the methods developed in the present paper (Propositions 7.9 and 7.10). Note that the family treated in [29] has non-zero average root number over $\mathbb{Z}$, but not over $\mathbb{Q}$; we will see an example of a non-constant family with non-zero average root number over $\mathbb{Q}$ in §7.4. It was intimated in [23] that the case of multiplicative reduction (identified by a certain technical condition, rather than reduction type) presented essential analytical difficulties. The likelihood of a relation of some sort between root number problems and the parity problem was already intuited by S. Wong [37]. One of the main points of this paper is to establish a precise relation.

Our main intermediate result (Thm. 6.6; see also Prop. 6.5) is valid both over number fields and function fields. Since, as it was pointed out by [4], the behaviour of the Liouville function λ on function fields differs clearly from its behaviour on number fields, Thm. 6.6 would lead one to believe that there are families $\mathscr{E}$ over $\mathbb{F}_q(u,t)$ for which $W(\mathscr{E}(t))$ cannot have strong zero average over $\mathbb{F}_q(u)$. This was in fact shown to be the case in [5], which stemmed in part from an early version of the present paper.

3. NOTATION

3.1. **Fields and valuations.** For us, a field K will be *global* if it is either a number field or the function field of a curve over a finite field. We write M_K for the set of all places of K, and $M_{K,\infty}$ for the set of archimedean places of K. Given a finite, non-empty set V of places of K containing $M_{K,\infty}$, we write $\mathscr{O}_{K,V}$ for the ring of V-integers of K and $I_{K,V}$ for the semigroup of non-zero ideals of $\mathscr{O}_{K,V}$. (The ring of V-integers $\mathscr{O}_{K,V}$ is defined to be $\mathscr{O}_{K,V} = \{x \in K : |x|_v \leq 1 \; \forall v \in M_K \setminus V\}$.) By a *prime* we shall mean either a place not in V or the prime ideal of $\mathscr{O}_{K,V}$ corresponding thereto, where V is given.

We denote the algebraic closure of a field K by $\overline{K}$, and its separable closure by K_s. Given a global field K, a finite Galois extension L/K, and a prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ of K, we denote by $\mathrm{Frob}_{\mathfrak{p}}$ the conjugacy class of Frobenius elements of $\mathfrak{p}$ in $\mathrm{Gal}(L/K)$.

A field is *local* if (a) it is complete with respect to a non-trivial discrete valuation, and (b) its residue field is finite. Given a local field K and its valuation v, a *ball* is a set of the form $\{x \in K : v(x - x_0) \geq k\}$, where $x_0 \in K$ and $-\infty \leq k < \infty$. (We may also call such a ball an *open ball*, as it is open (and closed).) The valuation v is always normalised so that its range is $\mathbb{Z}$. The ring of integers $\mathscr{O}_K$ of K is defined to be $\mathscr{O}_K = \{x \in K : v(x) \geq 0\} = \{x \in K : |x|_v \leq 1\}$.

By a *punctured ball* around x_0 we mean a set of the form $U \setminus \{x_0\}$, where U is any ball around x_0. In general, by a *punctured neighbourhood* around x_0, we mean a neighbourhood of x_0 with x_0 itself omitted.

3.2. **Ideals.** Let R be a Dedekind domain. Let $\mathfrak{a}$ be a non-zero ideal of R. We let $\mathrm{sq}(\mathfrak{a}) = \prod_{\mathfrak{p}^2|\mathfrak{a}} \mathfrak{p}^{v_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mathfrak{a})-1}$, $\lambda(\mathfrak{a}) = \prod_{\mathfrak{p}|\mathfrak{a}} (-1)^{v_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mathfrak{a})}$. By $\mathfrak{a}|\mathfrak{b}^\infty$ we will mean that $\mathfrak{p}|\mathfrak{b}$ for every prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ dividing $\mathfrak{a}$.

3.3. **Polynomials.** Let R be a Dedekind domain; let K be its field of fractions. As is standard, we define the resultant of two polynomials $f, g \in K[x]$ to be the determinant of the corresponding Sylvester matrix. Given two homogeneous polynomials $f, g \in K[x,y]$, we define the resultant to be the determinant of the Sylvester matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} a_n & \cdots & \cdots & a_0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & a_n & a_{n-1} & \cdots & \cdots & a_0 \\ b_m & \cdots & b_0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & b_m & b_{m-1} & \cdots & b_0 \end{pmatrix}$$

built up from the coefficients a_j, b_j of $f(x,y) = \sum_{j=0}^n a_j x^j y^{n-j}$, $g(x,y) = \sum_{j=0}^m b_j x^j y^{n-j}$, where $n = \deg f$, $m = \deg g$.

If $f, g \in R[x]$ are non-zero and coprime as elements of $K[x]$, then $\mathrm{Res}(f,g)$ is an element of R divisible by the ideal $\gcd(f(a), g(a))$ for every $a \in R$. If $f, g \in R[x,y]$ are non-zero, homogeneous and coprime as elements of $R[x,y]$, then $\mathrm{Res}(f,g)$ is an element of R

divisible by the ideal $\gcd(f(a,b),g(a,b))$ for every pair $(a,b) \in R^2$ with $\gcd(a,b) = 1$. More generally, if $(a,b) \in R^2$ satisfies $\gcd(a,b)|\mathfrak{d}$ for some ideal $\mathfrak{d}$ of R, then $\gcd(f(a,b),g(a,b))$ divides $\mathfrak{d} \cdot \mathrm{Res}(f,g)$.

3.4. **Elliptic curves.** Let E be an elliptic curve over a field K. We write $E([m])$ for the set of points of order m on E, and $T_\ell(E)$ for the Tate module. If K is a local field, we denote the reduction of E by $\widehat{E}$. When we say that E has potentially good reduction over K, we allow the possibility that E may actually have good reduction over K, as opposed to additive, potentially good reduction; the same holds with "multiplicative" instead of "good".

3.5. **Characters.** A *character* of an abelian topological group G is a continuous homomorphism from G to the unit circle $S^1 \subset \mathbb{C}$. Given a global field K and a prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$, we denote by $(\cdot/\mathfrak{p})$ the quadratic reciprocity symbol, that is, the character $(\cdot/\mathfrak{p})$ on $K_\mathfrak{p}^*$ given by

$$(x/\mathfrak{p}) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x = y^2 \text{ for some } y \in K_\mathfrak{p}^*, \\ -1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

3.6. **Sectors and lattices.** A *lattice* is a subgroup of $\mathbb{Z}^n$ of finite index; a *lattice coset* is a coset of such a subgroup. The *index* $[\mathbb{Z}^n : L]$ of a lattice L is simply its index as a subgroup of $\mathbb{Z}^n$, i.e., the number of elements of the quotient $\mathbb{Z}^n/L$. By a *sector* of $\mathbb{R}^n$ we will mean a connected component of a set of the form $\mathbb{R}^n - (T_1 \cap T_2 \cap \cdots \cap T_n)$, where T_i is a hyperplane going through the origin. (We will always have $n = 2$.)

3.7. **Complex-valued functions.** Let K be a field. By a *complex-valued function* on $\mathbb{P}^1(K)$ we will mean a function $f : U \to \mathbb{C}$ defined on the complement $U = \mathbb{P}^1(K) - \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$ of a finite set $\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$; by a *complex-valued function* on $\mathbb{A}^2(K)$ we will mean a function $f : U \to \mathbb{C}$ defined on the complement $U \subset \mathbb{A}^2(K)$ of a finite set of lines through the origin in $\mathbb{A}^2(K)$. (As is usual, we write $\mathbb{P}^1(K)$ for the projective line K^2/K^*, and $\mathbb{A}^2(K)$ for the affine plane K^2.) Two complex-valued functions on $\mathbb{P}^1(K)$ (or on $\mathbb{A}^2(K)$) will be regarded as identical if they agree on the intersection of their domains of definition. We write $C_{\mathbb{P}^1(K)}$ for the set of all complex-valued functions on $\mathbb{P}^1(K)$, and $C_{\mathbb{A}^2(K)}$ for the set of all complex-valued functions on $\mathbb{A}^2(K)$. (Formally, we may define $C_{\mathbb{P}^1(K)}$ as the set of all equivalence classes of pairs (U,f), where $(U,f) \sim (V,g)$ if $f|_{U\cap V} = g|_{U \cap V}$; the same may be done for $C_{\mathbb{A}^2}(K)$.)

4. Local root numbers

Let K be a local field of characteristic $\neq 2,3$. Let $\mathscr{E}$ be an elliptic curve over $K(T)$. We will investigate the local behaviour of $t \to W(\mathscr{E}(t))$; in particular, we will show that $t \to W(\mathscr{E}(t))$ is locally constant almost everywhere. We will also see how $t \to W(\mathscr{E}(t))$ behaves at the points where it is not locally constant.

While we allow ourselves to assume that $\mathrm{char}(K) \neq 2,3$, we must include in our treatment local fields K whose residue fields have characteristic 2 or 3, as such fields K arise as localisations of number fields. Thus we cannot simply make use of formulae valid only when the characteristic of the residue field is greater than 3 (Prop. 6.1).

Lemma 4.1. *Let K be a local field. Let $m \geq 2$ be an integer prime to the characteristic of the residue field of K. Let a minimal Weierstrass model over K give an elliptic curve E with good reduction. Then the map*

$$E[m] \to \widehat{E}[m]$$

induced by the reduction of the model is a bijective homomorphism.

Proof. The map is injective by [36], Ch. VII, Prop. 3.1(b) and a homomorphism by [36], Ch. VII, Prop. 2.1. Since m is prime to the residue characteristic of K, the finite sets $E[m]$ and $\widehat{E}[m]$ have the same cardinality, and thus an injective map from one to the other must be a bijection. □

It has been pointed out by B. Conrad [6] that the following proposition can be derived from a general result [21] on the local constancy of local systems over schemes of finite type over local fields. A representation-theoretical argument is also possible ([33]). We give an elementary proof.

Proposition 4.2. *Let K be a local field. Let $a_1, \dots, a_6 \in \mathscr{O}_K$ be the coefficients of a Weierstrass model for an elliptic curve E with potential good reduction. Then there is an $\epsilon > 0$ such that any $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_6 \in \mathscr{O}_K$ with $|\mathbf{a}_j - a_j| < \epsilon$ are the coefficients of a Weierstrass model for an elliptic curve $\mathbf{E}$ with $W(\mathbf{E}) = W(E)$.*

Proof. Let E acquire good reduction over a finite extension L/K. Then there is a change of variables $x' = u^2x + r$, $y' = u^3y + u^2sx + t$ with $u, r, s, t \in \mathscr{O}_L$ sending the original model $a_1, \dots, a_6$ to a minimal model $a'_1, \dots, a'_6$ with good reduction. By Lem. 4.1, any two distinct points $P_1, P_2 \in E[m]$ have either $|x(P_1) - x(P_2)| \geq 1$ or $|y(P_1) - y(P_2)| \geq 1$ in the minimal model, with $|x(P_1) - x(P_2)| < 1$ occurring only if $x(P_1) = x(P_2)$. Thus, either $|x(P_1) - x(P_2)| \geq |u|^{-2}$ or $|y(P_1) - y(P_2)| \geq |u|^{-3}$ in the original model.

Let $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_6 \in \mathscr{O}_K$ satisfy $|\mathbf{a}_j - a_j| < |u|^7$. Then the same change of variables as above will send $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_6$ to a minimal model $\mathbf{a}'_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}'_6 \in \mathscr{O}_K$, $|\mathbf{a}_j - a_j| < 1$, describing an elliptic curve $\mathbf{E}$ with good reduction. By Lem. 4.1, the maps $E[\ell^n] \to \widehat{E}[\ell^n]$ and $\mathbf{E}[\ell^n] \to \widehat{\mathbf{E}}[\ell^n]$ induced by the reduction of the minimal models are bijective homomorphisms. There is an isomorphism $\widehat{E}[\ell^n] \sim \widehat{\mathbf{E}}[\ell^n]$, since the minimal models reduce to the same model for $\widehat{E}$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{E}}$. Thus we have a bijective homomorphism $\iota_n : E[\ell^n] \to \mathbf{E}[\ell^n]$ with $|x(P) - x(\iota_n(P))| < 1$, $|y(P) - y(\iota_n(P))| < 1$ in the minimal models, and $|x(P) - x(\iota_n(P))| < |u|^{-2}$, $|y(P) - y(\iota_n(P))| < |u|^{-3}$ in the original models.

Now let $\gamma \in \mathrm{Gal}(\overline{K}/K)$. Then, in the original models, $|x(\gamma(P)) - x(\gamma(\iota_n(P)))| = |\gamma(x(P)) - \gamma(x(\iota_n(P)))| < |u|^{-2}$, $|y(\gamma(P)) - y(\gamma(\iota_n(P)))| < |u|^{-3}$ (since the norm is Galois-invariant) and $|x(\gamma(P)) - x(\iota_n(\gamma(P)))| < |u|^{-2}$, $|y(\gamma(P)) - y(\iota_n(\gamma(P)))| < |u|^{-3}$. As we would have $|x(\gamma(\iota_n(P))) - x(\iota_n(\gamma(P)))| \geq |u|^{-2}$ or $|y(\gamma(\iota_n(P))) - y(\iota_n(\gamma(P)))| \geq |u|^{-3}$ if $\gamma(\iota_n(P))$ were not equal to $\iota_n(\gamma(P))$, we can conclude that $\gamma(\iota_n(P)) = \iota_n(\gamma(P))$, i.e., ι_n respects the action of the Galois group on $E[\ell^n]$ and $\mathbf{E}[\ell^n]$. Therefore, ι_n induces an isomorphism of Tate modules $T_\ell(E) \to T_\ell(\mathbf{E})$ as $\mathrm{Gal}(\overline{K}/K)$-modules. Since E (and hence $\mathbf{E}$) has potentially good reduction, the root number $W(E)$ (resp. $W(\mathbf{E})$) is determined by the representation of the Weil group $\mathscr{W}(K) \subset \mathrm{Gal}(\overline{K}/K)$ on $T_\ell(E)$ (resp. $T_\ell(\mathbf{E})$). Hence $W(E) = W(\mathbf{E})$. □

Proposition 4.3. *Let K be a local field of characteristic $\neq 2$. Let $a_1, \dots, a_6 \in K$ induce a tuple $(c_4, c_6, \Delta) \in K^3$ with $c_4 \neq 0$, $\Delta = 0$. Then there is a constant $w \in \{-1, 1\}$ and an $\epsilon > 0$ such that any $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_6 \in K$ with $|\mathbf{a}_j - a_j| < \epsilon$ and $\mathbf{\Delta} \neq 0$ give a Weierstrass model for an elliptic curve $\mathbf{E}$ with $W(\mathbf{E}) = w$.*

Proof. We may assume $a_1, \dots, a_6 \in \mathscr{O}_K$. We wish to show first that there is one change of variables that sends any nearby $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_6 \in \mathscr{O}_K$ with $\mathbf{\Delta} \neq 0$ to a minimal Weierstrass model. Whether or not a change of variables $x' = u^2x + r$, $y' = u^3y + u^2sx + t$ ($u, r, s, t \in \mathscr{O}_K$, $u \neq 0$) sends a Weierstrass model over $\mathscr{O}_K$ to another Weierstrass model over $\mathscr{O}_K$ depends on r, s and t only modulo $u^6\mathscr{O}_K$; small changes in u do not matter either. Since $\{u \in K : 1 \leq |u| \leq C\}$ is compact for any C, it follows that, if we need consider only changes of variables with u bounded in norm from above, we may consider only a finite number of changes of variables. This is indeed the case, as we must have $|u| \leq |c_4|^{-1/4}$. For each of these finitely many changes of variables, there is a neighbourhood V of $(a_1, \dots, a_6)$ such that either all $(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_6) \in V$ are sent to integer tuples $(\mathbf{a}'_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}'_6)$, or none of them are. Let U be the intersection of all such neighbourhoods. Then U is an open set for which there is a single change of variables sending any $(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_6) \in \mathscr{O}_K$ with $\boldsymbol{\Delta} \neq 0$ to a minimal Weierstrass model.

We may now let that single change of variables act on $(a_1, \dots, a_6)$ and its neighbourhood; thus, we may assume that any $(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_6) \in U$ is minimal. Let $V \subset U$ be the set of all tuples $(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_6) \in U$ satisfying $\boldsymbol{\Delta} \neq 0$, $v(\mathbf{a}_j - a_j) \geq 0$ and $|j(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_6)| > 1$. Then $(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_6)$ will have (a) split multiplicative reduction, (b) unsplit multiplicative reduction or (c) additive, potentially multiplicative reduction depending on whether (a) $v(c_4) = 0$ and the reduction of $a_1, \dots, a_6$ describes a singular cubic with a split node, (b) $v(c_4) = 0$ and the reduction of $a_1, \dots, a_6$ describes a singular cubic with an unsplit node, (c) $v(c_4) > 0$. Thus, the reduction type is constant in the neighbourhood $\{(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_6) \in U : |\mathbf{a}_j - a_j| < 1, |j(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_6)| > 1\}$ of $(a_1, \dots, a_6)$. When an elliptic curve has multiplicative reduction, the root number depends only on whether the reduction is split or unsplit; when an elliptic curve has additive, potentially multiplicative reduction, the root number depends only on K and the class of $-c_6$ in $K^*/(K^*)^2$ (vd. [32], Thm. 2, (ii); cf. [3], §3). It follows that the root number is constant for all tuples $(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_6)$ with $\boldsymbol{\Delta} \neq 0$ in an open neighbourhood $V_0 \subset V$ of $(a_1, \dots, a_6)$. □

Let us now examine each kind of reduction that an elliptic curve $\mathscr{E}$ over $K(T)$ may have.

Lemma 4.4. *Let K be a local field. Let $\mathscr{E}$ be an elliptic curve over $K(T)$. Suppose $\mathscr{E}$ has a place of good reduction at $(T - t_0)$, where $t_0 \in K$. Then there is a neighbourhood U of t_0 on which $W(\mathscr{E}(t))$ is constant.*

Proof. If $\mathscr{E}(t_0)$ has potentially good reduction, apply Prop. 4.2. If $\mathscr{E}(t_0)$ has potentially multiplicative reduction, proceed as in the last paragraph of the proof of Prop. 4.3. □

Lemma 4.5. *Let K be a local field. Let $\mathscr{E}$ be an elliptic curve over $K(T)$. Suppose $\mathscr{E}$ has a place of multiplicative reduction at $(T - t_0)$, where $t_0 \in K$. Then there is a punctured neighbourhood U of t_0 on which $W(\mathscr{E}(t))$ is constant.*

Proof. Let (c_4, c_6, Δ) be parameters of a Weierstrass equation for $\mathscr{E}$ minimal over $K(T)$ with respect to the valuation induced by $(T - t_0)$. Then $(T - t_0)$ divides Δ but not c_4; moreover, $(T - t_0)$ is absent from the denominators of the parameters $a_1, \dots, a_6$. Apply Proposition 4.3. □

Lemma 4.6. *Let K be a local field of characteristic $\neq 2, 3$. Let $\mathscr{E}$ be an elliptic curve over $K(T)$. Suppose $\mathscr{E}$ has a place of additive, potentially multiplicative reduction at $(T - t_0)$, where $t_0 \in K$. Then there is a punctured neighbourhood U of t_0 on which $W(\mathscr{E}(t))$ depends only on $(t - t_0) \bmod K^{*2}$.*

Proof. Set $t_0 = 0$ for notational simplicity. Let $\mathscr{E}$ be given by parameters $c_4, c_6 \in K(T)$ minimal with respect to the valuation v_T induced by T. Let $a \in K^*$. For $t \in aK^{*2}$, we may substitute $t = a(t')^2$ and obtain new parameters $c'_4(t') = c_4(a(t')^2)$, $c'_6(t') = c_6(a(t')^2)$ describing an elliptic curve $\mathscr{E}'$ over $K(T')$. Since $v_T(c_4) = 4k + 2$, $v_T(c_6) = 6k + 3$, we obtain $v_{T'}(c'_4) = 4(2k + 1)$, $v_{T'}(c'_6) = 6(2k + 1)$, and thus $\mathscr{E}'$ has multiplicative reduction over $K(T')$ at T'. The statement now follows by Lem. 4.5. □

Lemma 4.7. *Let K be a local field of characteristic $\neq 2, 3$. Let $\mathscr{E}$ be an elliptic curve over $K(T)$. Suppose $\mathscr{E}$ has a place of potential good reduction at $(T - t_0)$, where $t_0 \in K$.*

Then there is a punctured neighbourhood U of t_0 on which $W(\mathscr{E}(t))$ depends only on $(t-t_0) \bmod K^{*12}$.

Proof. Set $t_0 = 0$ for notational simplicity. Let $\mathscr{E}$ be given by parameters $c_4, c_6 \in K(T)$ minimal with respect to v_T. Since $\operatorname{char}(K) \neq 2,3$, the curve $\mathscr{E}$ acquires good reduction over $K(T^{1/12})$. Let $a \in K^*$. For $t \in aK^{*12}$, we may substitute $t = a(t')^{12}$ and obtain new parameters $c_4'(t') = c_4(a(t')^{12})$, $c_6'(t') = c_6(a(t')^{12})$ describing an elliptic curve $\mathscr{E}'$ over $K(T')$. Since $\mathscr{E}$ has good reduction over $K(T^{1/12})$, there is a non-negative integer k such that $v_{T'}(c_4') = 4k$, $v_{T'}(c_6') = 6k$, $v_{T'}(\Delta') = 12k$. Thus $\mathscr{E}'$ has good reduction over $K(T')$ at T'. Apply Lem. 4.4. □

Theorem 4.8. *Let K be a local field of characteristic $\neq 2,3$. Let $\mathscr{E}$ be an elliptic curve over $K(T)$. Then, for every $t_0 \in \mathbb{P}^1(K)$, there is a punctured neighbourhood U_{t_0} of t_0 such that, for $t \in U_{t_0}$, the value of $f(t)$ depends only on $(t-t_0) \bmod (K^*)^{12}$. (For $t_0 = \infty$, read $1/t$ instead of $t - t_0$.)*

Then, for every $t_0 \in K$, there is a punctured neighbourhood U_{t_0} of t_0 and a function $g_{t_0} : K^*/(K^*)^n \to \mathbb{C}$ such that $f|_{U_{t_0}}(t) = g(t-t_0)$ for all $t \in U_{t_0}$. (For $t_0 = \infty$, read $1/t$ instead of $t - t_0$.)

Saying that the value of $f(t)$ depends only on $(t-t_0) \bmod (K^*)^n$ for $t \in U_{t_0}$ is the same as saying that $f(t) = g(t)$ for all $t \in U_{t_0}$ and some function $g : K^*/(K^*)^n \to \mathbb{C}$.

Proof. Immediate from Lemmas 4.4–4.7. □

* * *

Let us see at what sort of conclusion we have arrived. What does Theorem 4.8 tell us about the local root number $W(\mathscr{E}(t))$?

Let f be any convex-valued function on $\mathbb{P}^1(K)$, where K is a local field. Suppose that, for every $t_0 \in \mathbb{P}^1(K)$, there is a punctured neighbourhood U_{t_0} of t_0 such that, for $t \in U_{t_0}$, the value of $f(t)$ depends only on $(t-t_0) \bmod (K^*)^n$. (For $t_0 = \infty$, read $1/t$ instead of $t - t_0$.) Here n is a fixed integer; assume $\operatorname{char}(K) \nmid n$. What can we say about f?

First of all, f is locally constant almost everywhere. This can be shown as follows. Let the punctured neighbourhoods U_{t_0} be as above. Then $\{U_{t_0} \cup \{t_0\}\}_{t_0 \in \mathbb{P}^1(K)}$ is an open cover of $\mathbb{P}^1(K)$. Since $\mathbb{P}^1(K)$ is compact, there is a finite subcover $\{U_{t_0} \cup \{t_0\}\}_{t_0 \in S}$, $S \subset \mathbb{P}^1(K)$ finite. The claim is that, for every $t_1 \notin S$, the function $f(t)$ is constant in a neighbourhood of t_1. This is easy: the point t_1 must lie in some set U_{t_0}, $t_0 \in S$, $t_0 \neq t_1$; in that set U_{t_0}, $f(t)$ depends only on $(t-t_0) \mod (K^*)^n$; thus, $f(t)$ is constant on the set $V = (t_0 + (t_1 - t_0) \cdot (K^*)^n) \cap U_{t_0}$, which contains t_1. Since $\operatorname{char}(K) \nmid n$, the set $(K^*)^n$ is an open subset of K^* (this is a consequence of Hensel's lemma) and so V is an open neighbourhood of t_1 on which $f(t)$ is constant.

More can be said about such functions f. We could have proven that $t \to W(\mathscr{E}(t))$ is locally constant almost everywhere directly from Lemma 4.4. What we proved in Theorem 4.8 is stronger. Here is a way to use this stronger kind of conclusion. It will be useful later.

Lemma 4.9. *Let K be a local field. Let n be a positive integer such that $\operatorname{char}(K) \nmid n$. Let f be a convex-valued function on $\mathbb{P}^1(K)$. Suppose that, for every $t_0 \in K$, there is a punctured neighbourhood U_{t_0} of t_0 such that, for $t \in U_{t_0}$, the value of $f(t)$ depends only on $(t-t_0) \bmod (K^*)^n$. Suppose also that $f(t) \in \mathbb{Q}$ for all but finitely many t.*

Then, for every ball $U = \{x \in K : |x - x_0| < r\}$ with $x_0 \in K$ and $r < \infty$,

$$\int_U f(t)dt \tag{4.1}$$

is a rational number.

We do not need any assumptions about what happens at infinity because we are working on a neighbourhood U disjoint from infinity. (We do not consider an integral over all of K because such an integral would not in general be finite.)

Proof. We can assume that each punctured neighbourhood U_{t_0} is a punctured ball around t_0, as we can simply replace each open set U_{t_0} by a punctured ball around t_0 contained in it. Since U is compact, there is a finite cover of U by sets of the form $U \cap (U_{t_0} \cup \{t_0\})$. In a local field, given two balls, either they are disjoint or one contains the other. (This is so because local fields are non-archimedean.) Hence we actually have a cover of U by a finite number of disjoint balls $U_{t_0} \cup \{t_0\}$ contained in U. It will be enough to show that

$$\int_{U_{t_0}} f(t)dt$$

is rational.

By the statement, the values of $f(t)$ on U_{t_0} are rational (with finitely many exceptions) and depend only on $(t-t_0) \bmod (K^*)^n$. The punctured ball U_{t_0} is of the form $U_{t_0} = V_0 + t_0$ for some punctured ball V_0 around the origin. We can write

$$\int_{U_{t_0}} f(t)dt = \sum_{g\in K^*/(K^*)^n} \int_{g(K^*)^n \cap V_0} f(t+t_0)dt = \sum_{g\in K^*/(K^*)^n} f(g+t_0)\,\mathrm{Area}(g(K^*)^n \cap V_0), \tag{4.2}$$

where we write $f(g)$ for the value taken by $f(t+t_0)$ for all $t \in g(K^*)^n$. We may assume without loss of generality that $V_0 = \{x \in K^* : v(x) \geq 0\}$. (This assumption is notationally convenient.) To get that the integral in (4.2) is rational, it will be enough to show that $K^*/(K^*)^n$ is finite and that every set of the form $g(K^*)^n \cap \{x \in K^* : v(x) \geq 0\}$ has rational area.

The quotient $K^*/(K^*)^n$ is finite by Hensel's lemma. (It is here that we use the assumption that $\mathrm{char}(K) \nmid n$.) Every coset of $(K^*)^n$ can be written in the form $a(K^*)^n$ with $a \in K^*$, $0 \leq v(a) < n$. Now

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{Area}(\{x \in K^* : v(x) \geq 0,\ x \in a(K^*)^n\}) \\
&\quad = \mathrm{Area}(\{x \in K^* : v(x) = 0,\ x \in a(K^*)^n\}) \cdot (1 + q^{-n} + q^{-2n} + \dots) \\
&\quad = \frac{1}{1-q^{-n}} \mathrm{Area}(\{x \in K^* : v(x) = 0,\ x \in a(K^*)^n\}),
\end{aligned}$$

where q is the number of elements in the residue field of K. Again by Hensel's lemma, the set $\{x \in K^* : v(x) = 0, x \in a(K^*)^n\}$ is a union of (additive) cosets of $\mathfrak{p}^\ell$ for some fixed ℓ; thus, its area is a multiple of $q^{-\ell}$, and, in particular, it is a rational number. □

We will need to know integrals such as (4.1) for the following reason. Say K is the localisation $\mathbb{Q}_p$ of $\mathbb{Q}$ at a prime p. Then the function $t \to W_p(\mathscr{E}(t))$ from $\mathbb{Q}_p$ to $\{-1, 1\}$ induces a function from $\mathbb{Q}$ to $\{-1, 1\}$, simply by the inclusion $\mathbb{Q} \subset \mathbb{Q}_p$. (We write W_p for the local root number in the local field $\mathbb{Q}_p$.) We are interested in the average of $W_p(\mathscr{E}(t))$ over $\mathbb{Z}$. It is not hard to show that

$$\mathrm{av}_{\mathbb{Z}}\, W_p(\mathscr{E}(t)) = \int_{\mathbb{Z}_p} W_p(\mathscr{E}(t))dt. \tag{4.3}$$

(Here we use the fact that $W_p(\mathscr{E}(t))$ is locally constant almost everywhere.) By Thm. 4.8, it follows that $\mathrm{av}_{\mathbb{Z}}\, W_p(\mathscr{E}(t))$ is a rational number.

Notice, moreover, that this is a rational number that can be computed in finite time given the finite data describing $W_p(\mathscr{E}(t))$. There should be no concerns about the computability or constructibility of p-adic integrals of this kind. One can furthermore show that the averages $\frac{1}{N}\sum_{1\leq n\leq N} W_p(\mathscr{E}(n))$ not only converge to $\int_{\mathbb{Z}_p} W_p(\mathscr{E}(t))$, but do so very rapidly. (For more on rates of convergence, see Appendix A.)

We will not go into more details here, since we will prove more general results later. In particular, we will see that equalities such as (4.3) hold for all products of finitely many functions such as $W_p(\mathscr{E}(t))$ (as opposed to just one individual function $W_p(\mathscr{E}(t))$.

The key thing to realise here is that, as we saw in the introduction (§1.2), such equalities are not in general true for infinite products. Now, the global root number – our central object of study in this paper – is an infinite product $W(\mathscr{E}(t)) = \prod_v W_v(\mathscr{E}(t))$. Our task is then to re-express it as a finite product, or – when that is not possible – as the product of a finite product and an infinite product of a special kind.

It is no wonder that reciprocity will play a role here. Indeed, the law of quadratic reciprocity – just like higher reciprocity laws – can be expressed as the fact that $\prod_v \left(\frac{a,b}{v}\right) = 1$, where v goes over all places of a global field K and $\left(\frac{a,b}{v}\right)$ is the Hilbert symbol. (More about this later.) In other words, a product of Hilbert symbols over all but finitely many places of K is equal to (the multiplicative inverse of) a finite product of Hilbert symbols. This is what lies at the core of the following section.

5. Reciprocity and polynomials

5.1. **Introduction.** Characters to fixed moduli are harmless; characters to variable moduli are not. Consider, for instance, the Jacobi symbol $\left(\frac{\cdot}{\cdot}\right)$, which is a character modulo b. Suppose we know how to estimate sums of the form

$$\sum_{\substack{x,y\leq N\\ x\equiv x_0,\ y\equiv y_0 \bmod m}} f(x,y) \tag{5.1}$$

for all $m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, $x_0, y_0 \in \mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}$, where $f : \mathbb{Z}^2 \to \mathbb{C}$ is some function. Then we know how to estimate

$$\sum_{x,y\leq N} \left(\frac{x}{5}\right) f(x,y) \tag{5.2}$$

but not how to estimate

$$\sum_{x,y\leq N} \left(\frac{x}{y}\right) f(x,y). \tag{5.3}$$

We may be able to estimate a sum such as (5.3) in some particular cases (see, for instance, Appendix C); however, in general, a factor of $\left(\frac{x}{y}\right)$ is a very great bother.

When we start to compute the averages of the root number $W(\mathscr{E}(t))$, we shall have to deal with sums such as

$$\sum_{x,y\leq N} \left(\frac{2x+7y}{x^2+3xy+5y^2}\right) f(x,y). \tag{5.4}$$

This looks at least as bad as (5.3). In fact, this sum is as nice as (5.2), in that it can be computed given (5.1). The following observation is crucial:

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\frac{2x+7y}{x^2+3xy+5y^2}\right) &= (-1)^{(2x+7y-1)(x^2+3xy+5y^2)/4}\left(\frac{x^2+3xy+5y^2}{2x+7y}\right)\\ &= (-1)^{(2x+7y-1)(x^2+3xy+5y^2)/4}\left(\frac{2}{2x+7y}\right)\left(\frac{2x^2+6xy+10y^2}{2x+7y}\right)\\ &= (-1)^{P_1(x,y)}\left(\frac{(2x+7y)\cdot x-xy+10y^2}{2x+7y}\right)\\ &= (-1)^{P_1(x,y)}\cdot\left(\frac{-xy+10y^2}{2x+7y}\right)\\ &= (-1)^{P_2(x,y)}\cdot\left(\frac{y}{2x+7y}\right)\left(\frac{2}{2x+7y}\right)\left(\frac{-2x+20y}{2x+7y}\right)\\ &= (-1)^{P_3(x,y)}\cdot\left(\frac{2x+7y}{y}\right)\left(\frac{2x+7y}{2}\right)\left(\frac{27y}{2x+7y}\right)\\ &= (-1)^{P_4(x,y)}\left(\frac{2x}{y}\right)\left(\frac{y}{2}\right)\left(\frac{2x+7y}{27y}\right)\\ &= (-1)^{P_5(x,y)}\left(\frac{x}{y}\right)\left(\frac{x}{y}\right) = (-1)^{P_5(x,y)},\end{aligned}\tag{5.5}$$

where $P_1(x,y) = (2x+7y-1)(x^2+3xy+5y^2)/4 + ((2x+7y)^2-1)/8$, $P_2(x,y)$,..., $P_5(x,y)$ stand for homogeneous polynomials on x and y. The factors $\left(\frac{x}{y}\right)$ have cancelled out. Notice that the procedure is basically the Euclidean algorithm.

(Of course, there are parts of (5.5) that are not quite right – we proceeded as if the expressions inside a Jacobi symbol were always positive and odd, for instance. We can be careless because this is an introductory sketch.)

The crucial thing here is to realise that an expression of the form $(-1)^{P_5(x,y)}$ (where P_5 is a polynomial) is much better to average against than $\left(\frac{x}{y}\right)$ is. If we know (5.1), then we can average

$$\sum_{x,y\leq N} (-1)^{P_5(x,y)} f(x,y),$$

and thus we can average (5.4), which we have just shown to be the same.

In this section, we shall show that we can simplify matters as we just did whenever we have a Jacobi symbol (or any reciprocity symbol like it) of the form $\left(\frac{f(x,y)}{g(x,y)}\right)$, where f and g are homogeneous polynomials and either $\deg(f)$ or $\deg(g)$ is even. Happily enough, either $\deg(f)$ or $\deg(g)$ will be even in all of our later applications.

5.2. **Symbols and polynomials.**

We will find it convenient to work abstractly; that is, we will work for a while with an abstract symbol $(a|b)$ that is assumed to have all of the properties that a suitably generalised quadratic reciprocity symbol must have. (It will actually be better to work with a family of symbols $(a|b)_{\mathfrak{d}}$, rather than a single symbol $(a|b)$.)

Our aim is to show that expressions of the form $(f(x,y)|g(x,y))$ can be simplified. Here f and g are homogeneous polynomials.

Let K be a global field. Let $V \subset M_K$ be a finite set of places including all the archimedean ones. Consider a function

$$(\cdot|\cdot)_{\mathfrak{d}} : \{a, b \in \mathscr{O}_{K,V} : b \neq 0, \gcd(a,b) | \mathfrak{d}^\infty\} \to \mathbb{C} \tag{5.6}$$

for every non-zero ideal $\mathfrak{d}$ of $\mathscr{O}_{K,V}$. Assume that $(\cdot|\cdot)_{\mathfrak{d}}$ satisfies the following conditions for some set $\mathscr{C}$ of functions from $\mathscr{O}_{K,V}$ to $\mathbb{C}$, some set of functions $\mathscr{C}'$ from $K^* \times K^*$ to $\mathbb{C}$ and all non-zero $a, b, c \in \mathscr{O}_{K,V}$:

(a) $(ab|c)_{\mathfrak{d}} = (a|c)_{\mathfrak{d}} \cdot (b|c)_{\mathfrak{d}}$,
(b) $(a|bc)_{\mathfrak{d}} = (a|b)_{\mathfrak{d}} \cdot (a|c)_{\mathfrak{d}}$,
(c) $(a|b)_{\mathfrak{d}} = (a + bc|b)_{\mathfrak{d}}$,
(d) $(a|b)_{\mathfrak{d}} = f_{\mathfrak{d},b}(a)$ for $a, b \neq 0$, where $f_{\mathfrak{d},b} \in \mathscr{C}$,
(e) $(a|b)_{\mathfrak{d}_1} = f_{\mathfrak{d}_1,\mathfrak{d}_2}(a,b)(a|b)_{\mathfrak{d}_2}$ for $a, b \neq 0$, $\mathfrak{d}_1|\mathfrak{d}_2$ with $\gcd(a,b)|\mathfrak{d}_1^\infty$, where $f_{\mathfrak{d}_1,\mathfrak{d}_2} \in \mathscr{C}'$,
(f) $(a|b)_{\mathfrak{d}_1} = g_{\mathfrak{d}_1,\mathfrak{d}_2}(a,b)(a|b)_{\mathfrak{d}_2}$ for $a, b \neq 0$, $\mathfrak{d}_2|\mathfrak{d}_1$ with $\gcd(a,b)|\mathfrak{d}_2^\infty$, where $g_{\mathfrak{d}_1,\mathfrak{d}_2} \in \mathscr{C}'$,
(g) $(a|b)_{\mathfrak{d}} = f_{\mathfrak{d}}(a,b) \cdot (b|a)_{\mathfrak{d}}$ for $a, b \neq 0$, where $f_{\mathfrak{d}} \in \mathscr{C}'$.

(Each of these equations is meant to hold whenever all symbols on the right side are defined. For example, (a) is applicable when $\gcd(a,c)|\mathfrak{d}^\infty$, $\gcd(b,c)|\mathfrak{d}^\infty$ and $c = 0$: by (5.6), this is what must hold for $(a|c)_{\mathfrak{d}}$ and $(b|c)_{\mathfrak{d}}$ to be both defined.)

We will now define a set of functions $\mathscr{D}$ that we will use in our next result. (We will later be able to show that, in the case we care about, all functions in $\mathscr{D}$ have some rather nice properties.) Let $\mathscr{D}$ be the set of all complex-valued functions f on $\mathbb{A}^2(K)$ of the form

$$\begin{aligned} f(x,y) = {} & F_{1,1}(P_1(x,y)) \cdot F_{1,2}(P_2(x,y)) \cdots F_{1,k}(P_k(x,y)) \\ & \cdot F_{2,1}(Q_1(x,y), R_1(x,y)) \cdot F_{2,2}(Q_2(x,y), R_2(x,y)) \cdots F_{2,k'}(Q_{k'}(x,y), R_{k'}(x,y)), \end{aligned}$$

where k, k' are non-negative integers, $F_{1,j} \in \mathscr{C}$, $F_{2,j} \in \mathscr{C}'$, $P_j \in \mathscr{O}_{K,V}[x,y]$ is non-zero and homogeneous, and, for each $j \leq k'$, $Q_j, R_j \in \mathscr{O}_{K,V}[x,y]$ are non-zero, homogeneous and coprime as elements of $K[x,y]$.

Since $F_{2,j}(a,b)$ is undefined when $a = 0$ or $b = 0$, a function $f(x,y)$ in $\mathscr{D}$ may be undefined when x/y takes a value within a finite set (namely, the set of roots of $F_{2,j}(t,1) = 0$).

We recall that $\operatorname{Res}(f,g)$ stands for the resultant of f and g (§3.3).

Proposition 5.1. *Let K be a global field; let V be a finite set of places of K including all archimedean ones. Let $\mathscr{D}$ and $(\cdot|\cdot)$ be as above. Let $f, g \in \mathscr{O}_{K,V}[x,y]$ be non-zero, homogeneous and coprime as elements of $K[x,y]$. Let $\mathfrak{d}$ be an ideal of $\mathscr{O}_{K,V}$ such that $\operatorname{Res}(f,g)|\mathfrak{d}^\infty$. Let $\mathfrak{d}_0|\mathfrak{d}^\infty$. Then there is a function h in $\mathscr{D}$ such that*

$$(f(x,y)|g(x,y))_{\mathfrak{d}} = h(x,y)(x|y)_{\mathfrak{d}_0}^{(\deg f)(\deg g)}$$

for all $x, y \in \mathscr{O}_{K,V}$ with $\gcd(x,y)$ dividing $\mathfrak{d}^\infty$ and x/y outside a finite subset of $\mathbb{P}^1(K)$.

The proof of the proposition mimics the Euclidean algorithm.

Proof. We may assume $x, y \neq 0$, $f(x,y) \neq 0$, $g(x,y) \neq 0$ throughout, as these conditions hold for all x, y with x/y outside a finite subset of $\mathbb{P}^1(K)$. If $\deg(g) = 0$, the result follows from condition (d). If $\deg(f) = 0$, the result follows from (g) and (d). If f or g is reducible, the statement follows by (a) or (b) from cases with lower $\deg(f) + \deg(g)$. If f is irreducible and $g = cx$, c a non-zero element of $\mathscr{O}_{K,V}$, then, by (a), (b), (c), (f) and (g),

$$\begin{aligned} (f(x,y)|g(x,y))_{\mathfrak{d}} &= (a_0x^k + a_1x^{k-1}y + \cdots + a_ky^k|cx)_{\mathfrak{d}} \\ &= (f(x,y)|c)_{\mathfrak{d}} \cdot (a_ky^k|x)_{\mathfrak{d}} \\ &= (f(x,y)|c)_{\mathfrak{d}} \cdot (a_k|x)_{\mathfrak{d}} \cdot (y|x)_{\mathfrak{d}}^k \\ &= (f(x,y)|c)_{\mathfrak{d}} \cdot (a_k|x)_{\mathfrak{d}} \cdot f_{\mathfrak{d}}^k(y,x) g_{\mathfrak{d},\mathfrak{d}_0}^k(x,y)(x|y)_{\mathfrak{d}_0}^k \end{aligned}$$

for some $f_{\mathfrak{d}}, g_{\mathfrak{d},\mathfrak{d}_0} \in \mathscr{C}'$. The result then follows from (d), the definition of $\mathscr{D}$ and the case of $(\text{constant}|x)_{\mathfrak{d}}$, which we have already treated. The same works for f irreducible, $g = cy$. The case of g irreducible, $f = cx$ or cy follows from (g) and the above. For f, g irreducible, $\deg(f) < \deg(g)$, we apply (g). We are left with the case of f, g irreducible, $f, g \neq cx, cy$, $\deg(f) \geq \deg(g)$. Write $f = a_0 x^k + \cdots + a_k y^k$, $g = b_0 x^l + b_1 x^{l-1} y + \cdots + b_l y^l$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}(f(x,y)|g(x,y))_{\mathfrak{d}} &= f_{\mathfrak{d},b_0\mathfrak{d}}(x,y)(f(x,y)|g(x,y))_{b_0\mathfrak{d}}\\ &= f_{\mathfrak{d},b_0\mathfrak{d}}(x,y)(b_0|g(x,y))_{b_0\mathfrak{d}}(b_0 f(x,y)|g(x,y))_{b_0\mathfrak{d}}\\ &= f_{\mathfrak{d},b_0\mathfrak{d}}(x,y)(b_0|g(x,y))_{b_0\mathfrak{d}}(b_0 f(x,y) - a_0 g(x,y)|g(x,y))_{b_0\mathfrak{d}}\end{aligned}$$

for all $(x,y) \in \mathscr{O}_{K,V}^2$ such that $\gcd(x,y)|\mathfrak{d}_0$ and $b_0 f(x,y) - a_0 g(x,y) \neq 0$. The coefficient of x^k in $b_0 f(x,y) - a_0 g(x,y)$ is zero. Hence $b_0 f(x,y) - a_0 g(x,y)$ is a multiple of y. Since f and g are coprime as elements of $K[x,y]$, the linear combination $b_0 f(x,y) - a_0 g(x,y)$ cannot be the zero polynomial; either it is a reducible polynomial or it is a non-zero constant times y. The former case has already been treated. By (g), the latter case reduces to f irreducible, $g = cy$, which is a situation we have already considered. □

5.3. **Conclusions on quadratic reciprocity.** Let K be a global field. Assume that the characteristic of K is $\neq 2$. Let $V \subset M_K$ be a finite set of places including all archimedean ones. Define

$$(a|b)_{\mathfrak{d}} = \prod_{\substack{\mathfrak{p} \in M_K \setminus V\\ \mathfrak{p} \nmid 2\mathfrak{d}}} (a/\mathfrak{p})^{v_{\mathfrak{p}}(b)}, \tag{5.7}$$

for all non-zero $a, b \in K^*$. For $a = 0$, $b \in K^*$, set $(a|b)_{\mathfrak{d}} = 1$. (For further reference, note that the condition $\mathfrak{p} \nmid 2\mathfrak{d}$ in (5.7) is equivalent to $\mathfrak{p} \nmid \mathfrak{d}$ when $2|\mathfrak{d}$.)

Here $(a/\mathfrak{p})$ is simply the quadratic reciprocity symbol, meaning a non-trivial character $(\cdot/\mathfrak{p})$ on $K_{v_{\mathfrak{p}}}^*$ given by

$$(x/\mathfrak{p}) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x = y^2 \text{ for some } y \in K_{v_{\mathfrak{p}}}^*,\\ -1 & \text{otherwise.}\end{cases} \tag{5.8}$$

We want to prove that conditions (a)–(g) in subsection 5.2 hold. Let us define the sets $\mathscr{C}$ and $\mathscr{C}'$ first, since the statements of conditions (a)–(g) involve these sets.

We define $\mathscr{C}$ to be the set of all functions $f : \mathscr{O}_{K,V} \to \mathbb{C}$ of the form

$$f(x) = (x/\mathfrak{p}_1) \cdot (x/\mathfrak{p}_2) \cdots (x/\mathfrak{p}_k),$$

where k is any non-negative integer and $\mathfrak{p}_1, \mathfrak{p}_2, \ldots, \mathfrak{p}_k$ are finite places of K not in V. We define $\mathscr{C}'$ to be the set of all functions $g : K^* \times K^* \to \{-1, 1\}$ of the form

$$g(x,y) = g_1(x,y) \cdot g_2(x,y) \cdots g_k(x,y), \tag{5.9}$$

where, for each $j \leq k$, v_j is a place of K and g_j is a function from $K_{v_j}^*/(K_{v_j}^*)^2 \times K_{v_j}^*/(K_{v_j}^*)^2$ to $\{0, -1, 1\}$.

Corollary 5.2 (to Proposition 5.1)**.** *Let K be a global field with $\mathrm{char}(K) \neq 2$; let V be a finite, non-empty set of places of K including all the archimedean places. Let $f, g \in \mathscr{O}_{K,V}[x,y]$ be non-zero, homogeneous, and coprime as elements of $K[x,y]$. Let $\mathfrak{d}$ be a non-zero ideal of $\mathscr{O}_{K,V}$ such that $\mathrm{Res}(f,g)|\mathfrak{d}^\infty$. Let $\mathfrak{d}_0|\mathfrak{d}^\infty$. Let $(\cdot|\cdot)_{\mathfrak{d}}$ be as in (5.7). Then, Then, for all $x, y \in \mathscr{O}_{K,V}$ with x/y outside a finite subset of $\mathbb{P}^1(K)$ and $\gcd(x,y)|\mathfrak{d}^\infty$,*

$$(f(x,y)|g(x,y))_{\mathfrak{d}} = \begin{cases} h(x,y) \cdot (x|y)_{\mathfrak{d}_0} & \textit{if } \deg f,\ \deg g \textit{ are both odd}\\ h(x,y) & \textit{otherwise}\end{cases} \tag{5.10}$$

for some complex-valued function h on $\mathbb{A}^2(K)$ of the form

$$h(x,y) = g_1(P_1(x,y), Q_1(x,y)) \cdot g_2(P_2(x,y), Q_2(x,y)) \cdot \dots \cdot g_k(P_k(x,y), Q_k(x,y)), \tag{5.11}$$

where, for each $j \le k$, v_j is a place of K, g_j is a function from $K_{v_j}^*/(K_{v_j}^*)^2 \times K_{v_j}^*/(K_{v_j}^*)^2$ to $\{-1,1\}$, and $P_j, Q_j \in \mathscr{O}_{K,V}[x,y]$ are non-zero, homogeneous and coprime as elements of $K[x,y]$.

Proof. It is clear that, given our current definitions of $\mathscr{C}$ and $\mathscr{C}'$, the functions $h(x,y)$ of the form above are simply the elements of the set $\mathscr{D}$ defined in §5.2. (A function of the form $(P(x,y)/\mathfrak{p})$ can be written in the form $g(P(x,y),Q(x,y))$, where Q is identically one and $g(x,y) = (x/\mathfrak{p})$.) For the corollary to follow from Prop. 5.1, it remains only to check that the symbols $(a|b)_{\mathfrak{d}}$ defined by (5.7) satisfy the properties (a)–(g) listed in §5.2 for all $a, b \in \mathscr{O}_{K,V}$ with $b \neq 0$, $\gcd(a,b)|\mathfrak{d}^\infty$.

(a): This is true because $a \mapsto (a/\mathfrak{p})$ is a multiplicative function.

(b): True by definition (5.7).

(c): This is true because $(a/\mathfrak{p}) = (a + x/\mathfrak{p})$ for all $a \notin \mathfrak{p}$, $x \in \mathfrak{p}$, provided that $\mathfrak{p} \nmid 2$. (This is why we omitted primes $\mathfrak{p}$ dividing 2 from the product in (5.7).)

(d): This holds because $(a/\mathfrak{p})$ is a character of the multiplicative group of the residue field of $K_{v_\mathfrak{p}}$.

(e): By (5.7),

$$\frac{(a|b)_{\mathfrak{d}_1}}{(a|b)_{\mathfrak{d}_2}} = \prod_{\substack{\mathfrak{p} \in M_K \setminus V \\ \mathfrak{p} | 2\mathfrak{d}_2 \\ \mathfrak{p} \nmid 2\mathfrak{d}_1}} (a/\mathfrak{p})^{v_\mathfrak{p}(b)}.$$

Since $(a/\mathfrak{p})$ is the quadratic reciprocity symbol, it depends on $a \in \mathscr{O}_{K,V} \setminus \{0\}$ only as an element of $K_{v_\mathfrak{p}}^*/(K_{v_\mathfrak{p}}^*)^2$. The valuation $v_\mathfrak{p}(b) \bmod 2$ depends on b only as an element of $K_{v_\mathfrak{p}}^*/(K_{v_\mathfrak{p}}^*)^2$ (since the valuation of a square is even, i.e., $\equiv 0 \bmod 2$), and so we are done.

(f): Same as (e).

(g): This is essentially the quadratic reciprocity law, and thus it will take the most work to check. Let $\left(\frac{a,b}{\mathfrak{p}}\right)$ be the quadratic Hilbert symbol, defined by

$$\left(\frac{a,b}{v}\right) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } z^2 = ax^2 + by^2 \text{ has a non-zero solution } (x,y,z) \in K_v \times K_v \times K_v \\ -1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{5.12}$$

for $a, b \in K_v^*$, v a place of K. For any $a, b \in \mathscr{O}_{K,V}$ with $b \neq 0$, $\gcd(a,b)|\mathfrak{d}^\infty$,

$$(a|b)_\mathfrak{d} = \prod_{\substack{\mathfrak{p} \in M_K \setminus V \\ \mathfrak{p} \nmid 2\mathfrak{d}}} (a/\mathfrak{p})^{v_\mathfrak{p}(b)} = \prod_{\substack{\mathfrak{p} \in M_K \setminus V \\ \mathfrak{p} \nmid 2\mathfrak{d} \\ \mathfrak{p} | b}} \left(\frac{b,a}{\mathfrak{p}}\right),$$

since $\left(\frac{b,a}{\mathfrak{p}}\right) = (a/\mathfrak{p})$ for $\mathfrak{p} \nmid a$, $v_\mathfrak{p}(b)$ odd, and $\left(\frac{b,a}{\mathfrak{p}}\right) = 1$ for $\mathfrak{p} \nmid a$, $v_\mathfrak{p}(b)$ even (see, e.g., [25, Prop. V.3.4]). Similarly, $(b|a)_\mathfrak{d} = \prod_{\mathfrak{p} \in M_K \setminus V : \mathfrak{p} \nmid 2\mathfrak{d}} (b/\mathfrak{p})^{v_\mathfrak{p}(a)} = \prod_{\mathfrak{p} \in M_K \setminus V : \mathfrak{p} \nmid 2\mathfrak{d}, \mathfrak{p}|a} \left(\frac{a,b}{\mathfrak{p}}\right)$.

Thus

$$\frac{(a|b)_{\mathfrak{d}}}{(b|a)_{\mathfrak{d}}} = \prod_{\substack{\mathfrak{p}\in M_K\setminus V\\ \mathfrak{p}\nmid 2\mathfrak{d}}} (a/\mathfrak{p})^{v_{\mathfrak{p}}(b)} \prod_{\substack{\mathfrak{p}\in M_K\setminus V\\ \mathfrak{p}\nmid 2\mathfrak{d}}} (b/\mathfrak{p})^{-v_{\mathfrak{p}}(a)} = \prod_{\substack{\mathfrak{p}\in M_K\setminus V\\ \mathfrak{p}\nmid 2\mathfrak{d}\\ \mathfrak{p}|b}} \left(\frac{b,a}{\mathfrak{p}}\right) \prod_{\substack{\mathfrak{p}\in M_K\setminus V\\ \mathfrak{p}\nmid 2\mathfrak{d}\\ \mathfrak{p}|a}} \left(\frac{a,b}{\mathfrak{p}}\right)^{-1}$$

$$= \prod_{\substack{\mathfrak{p}\in M_K\setminus V\\ \mathfrak{p}\nmid 2\mathfrak{d}\\ \mathfrak{p}|ab}} \left(\frac{a,b}{\mathfrak{p}}\right)^{-1},$$

where we use the fact that $\left(\frac{a,b}{p}\right)^{-1} = \left(\frac{b,a}{p}\right)$. (This is true for all Hilbert symbols ([25, Prop. V.3.2 (iv)]); in the case of the quadratic Hilbert symbol, which is the one we are treating, this follows easily from $\left(\frac{a,b}{p}\right) = \left(\frac{b,a}{p}\right)$ (directly from the definition) and $\left(\frac{b,a}{p}\right) = \pm 1$.)

Now, since $\left(\frac{a,b}{p}\right) = 1$ for $\mathfrak{p}$ finite and $\mathfrak{p} \nmid a, b$ (see, e.g., [25, Prop. V.3.4]),

$$\prod_{\substack{\mathfrak{p}\in M_K\setminus V\\ \mathfrak{p}\nmid 2\mathfrak{d}\\ \mathfrak{p}|ab}} \left(\frac{a,b}{\mathfrak{p}}\right)^{-1} = \prod_{\substack{\mathfrak{p}\in M_K\setminus V\\ \mathfrak{p}\nmid 2\mathfrak{d}}} \left(\frac{a,b}{\mathfrak{p}}\right)^{-1}.$$

The above is mostly language. Now we will use the product formula

$$\prod_{v\in M_K} \left(\frac{a,b}{v}\right) = 1 \tag{5.13}$$

(vd. [25, Thm. VI.8.1]); this is in some sense the core of reciprocity (both quadratic and higher). By (5.13), we now have

$$\frac{(a|b)_{\mathfrak{d}}}{(b|a)_{\mathfrak{d}}} = \prod_{\substack{\mathfrak{p}\in M_K\setminus V\\ \mathfrak{p}\nmid 2\mathfrak{d}}} \left(\frac{a,b}{\mathfrak{p}}\right)^{-1} = \prod_{v\in V\cup\{\mathfrak{p}:\mathfrak{p}|2\mathfrak{d}\}} \left(\frac{a,b}{\mathfrak{p}}\right)^{-1}. \tag{5.14}$$

For every place v, the map $(a,b) \mapsto \left(\frac{a,b}{v}\right)$ is in fact a function on $K_v^*/K_v^{*2} \times K_v^*/K_v^{*2}$, i.e., it depends on a and b only modulo $(K_v^*)^2$; this follows from the definition (5.12) of the quadratic Hilbert symbol[3]. Hence $\frac{(a|b)_{\mathfrak{d}}}{(b|a)_{\mathfrak{d}}}$ is of the form (5.9). □

Remark. It should be clear from the proof that one should be able to prove similar statements for higher reciprocity symbols defined in terms of the general Hilbert symbol for arbitrary n (defined as in [25], Prop. V.3). We shall not need this, and will not elaborate on this further.

Remark. This is as good a place as any to answer the following question: why do we insist in statements of the form "for all $(x,y) \in K \times K$ satisfying $\gcd(x,y)|\mathfrak{d}_0$" rather than simply requiring x and y to be coprime (that is, $\gcd(x,y) = 1$)? The answer is that, if $\mathscr{O}_{K,V}$ is not a unique factorisation domain, there may be elements $t \in K$ that cannot be expressed as quotients $t = x/y$ with x, y coprime.

---

[3] This is also true by definition in greater generality, with K_v^*/K_v^{*2} replaced by K_v^*/K_v^{*n}. See the definition in [25, p. 333].

We will find the following consequence of Corollary 5.2 to be particularly useful. We recall that $P_w \in \mathscr{O}_{K,V}[x,y]$ is a homogeneous polynomial associated to a place w of $K(T)$ (see §2.1.1).

Corollary 5.3. *Let K be a global field with $\mathrm{char}(K) \neq 2$. Let w be a place of $K(T)$. Let $f \in (K(T))^*$ be a rational function with $w(f)$ even.*

Let V be a finite, non-empty set of places of K including all archimedean places. Let $\mathfrak{d}_0$ be a non-zero ideal of $\mathscr{O}_{K,V}$. Then, for all $x, y \in \mathscr{O}_{K,V}$ with x/y outside a finite subset of $\mathbb{P}^1(K)$ and $\gcd(x,y)|\mathfrak{d}^\infty$, the expression $(f(x/y)|P_w(x,y))_{\mathfrak{d}}$ can be written in the form

$$\begin{aligned}(f(x/y)|P_w(x,y))_{\mathfrak{d}_0}& \\ &= g_1(P_1(x,y),Q_1(x,y)) \cdot g_2(P_2(x,y),Q_2(x,y)) \cdot \dots \cdot g_k(P_k(x,y),Q_k(x,y)),\end{aligned}$$

where v_j is a place of K, g_j is a function from $K_{v_j}^*/(K_{v_j}^*)^2 \times K_{v_j}^*/(K_{v_j}^*)^2$ to $\{-1,1\}$, and and $P_j, Q_j \in \mathscr{O}_{K,V}[x,y]$ are non-zero, homogeneous and coprime as elements of $K[x,y]$.

Proof. We can write

$$f(x/y) = c \cdot \prod_{w' : w'(f) \neq 0} P_{w'}(x,y)^{w'(f)},$$

where $c \in K^*$. Write $c = c_0/c_1$, where $c_0, c_1 \in \mathscr{O}_{K,V}$. Let

$$\mathfrak{d} = c_0 \cdot c_1 \cdot \mathfrak{d}_0 \cdot \prod_{w' : w'(f) \neq 0} \mathrm{Res}(P_w, P_{w'}).$$

Since $(a|b)_{\mathfrak{d}}$ is multiplicative on 1, and equal to 1 when $a \in (K^*)^2$,

$$(f(x/y)|P_w(x,y))_{\mathfrak{d}} = (c_0|P_w(x,y))_{\mathfrak{d}}(c_1|P_w(x,y))_{\mathfrak{d}}^{-1} \prod_{w' : w'(f) \text{ odd}} (P_{w'}(x,y)|P_w(x,y))_{\mathfrak{d}}.$$

Since we are assuming that $w(f)$ is even, every place w' appearing in $\prod_{w' : w'(f) \text{ odd}}$ satisfies $w' \neq w$.

By Corollary 5.2, each factor $(P_{w'}(x,y)|P_w(x,y))_{\mathfrak{d}}$ is of the form

$$(P_{w'}(x,y)|P_w(x,y))_{\mathfrak{d}} = \begin{cases} h_{w'}(x,y) \cdot (x|y)_{\mathfrak{d}_0} & \text{if } \deg(w'), \deg(w) \text{ are both odd} \\ h_{w'}(x,y) & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $h_{w'}$ is as in (5.11). Now, since f is an element of $K(T)$, we know that

$$\prod_{w'} w'(f) \deg(w') = 0,$$

and so $\prod_{w' : w'(f) \text{ odd}} \deg(w')$ is even. Hence, the factors $(x|y)_{\mathfrak{d}_0}$ that arise in the terms $(P_{w'}(x,y)|P_w(x,y))_{\mathfrak{d}}$ cancel out when the product is taken over all w' with $w'(f)$ odd.

Again by Corollary 5.2, $(c_0|P_w(x,y))_{\mathfrak{d}}$ and $(c_1|P_w(x,y))_{\mathfrak{d}}$ are themselves of the form (5.11).

It remains to show that $(f(x/y)|P_w(x,y))_{\mathfrak{d}_0}/(f(x/y)|P_w(x,y))_{\mathfrak{d}}$ is of the form (5.11). Now

$$\frac{(f(x/y)|P_w(x,y))_{\mathfrak{d}_0}}{(f(x/y)|P_w(x,y))_{\mathfrak{d}}} = \prod_{\substack{\mathfrak{p} \in M_K \setminus V \\ \mathfrak{p} \nmid 2\mathfrak{d}_0 \wedge \mathfrak{p} | 2\mathfrak{d}}} (f(x/y)/\mathfrak{p})^{v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y))}.$$

This is clearly of the form (5.11) with $P_j(x,y) = P_w(x,y)$ and $Q_j(x,y) = f(x/y) \cdot y^{2\lceil \deg(f) \rceil}$. □

5.4. **Integrals.** We still need to show that expressions such as (5.11) are good to work with. In other words, we need to show that, in Corollary 5.2 and 5.3, we reduced expressions involving reciprocity symbols to something simpler and more useful, not to something more complicated. It is clear that (5.11) is a product over finitely many places, whereas (global) reciprocity symbols are products over all places of K. We must still examine the individual terms of (5.11) and show we can work with them.

Each place v that contributes to (5.11) makes a contribution of the form

$$g_1(P_1(x,y),Q_1(x,y))\cdot g_2(P_2(x,y),Q_2(x,y))\cdot\dots\cdot g_r(P_r(x,y),Q_r(x,y)),$$

where each g_j is a function from $K_v^*/(K_v^*)^2\times K_v^*/(K_v^*)^2$ to $\{-1,1\}$, and $P_j,Q_j\in\mathscr{O}_{K,V}[x,y]$ are non-zero, homogeneous and coprime as elements of $K[x,y]$.

Lemma 5.4. *Let K_v be a local field. Let n be a positive integer; assume either* $\mathrm{char}(K_v)=0$ *or* $n\nmid\mathrm{char}(K_v)$. *Let g be a complex-valued function on $\mathbb{A}^2(K_v)$ of the form*

$$g(x,y)=g_1(P_1(x,y),Q_1(x,y))\cdot g_2(P_2(x,y),Q_2(x,y))\cdot\dots\cdot g_r(P_r(x,y),Q_r(x,y)),$$

where each g_j is a function from $K_v^*/(K_v^*)^n\times K_v^*/(K_v^*)^n$ to $\{-1,1\}$, and $P_j,Q_j\in K_v[x,y]$ are non-zero and homogeneous.

Then g is locally constant at all points where it is defined, i.e., it is locally constant on the complement of finitely many lines through the origin.

Proof. Since (by Hensel's lemma) $(K_v^*)^n$ is an open subset of K_v^*, every function from $(K_v^*)/(K_v^*)^n\times(K_v^*)/(K_v^*)^n$ to $\mathbb{C}$ induces a function from $K_v^*\times K_v^*$ to $\mathbb{C}$ that is everywhere locally constant. A pair of polynomials $P,Q\in K_v[x,y]$ induce a function $(x,y)\mapsto(P(x,y),Q(x,y))$ from $K_v\times K_v$ to $K_v^*\times K_v^*$ that is defined and locally constant outside a finite number of lines through the origin (given by $y=rx$, where r runs through the set of roots to $P(1,r)=0$ and the set of roots to $Q(1,r)=0$). Hence the composition $(x,y)\mapsto g(P(x,y),Q(x,y))$ is locally constant outside a finite number of lines through the origin. A finite product of such functions will itself be locally constant outside a finite number of lines through the origin. □

We can go further. Let us examine the one-variable case first. The main results in what follows are Cor. 5.7 and Cor. 5.10.

5.4.1. *Lemmas on integration in one variable.*

Lemma 5.5. *Let K_v be a local field. Let n be a positive integer; assume either* $\mathrm{char}(K_v)=0$ *or* $n\nmid\mathrm{char}(K_v)$. *Let $P\in K_v[t]$ be a non-zero polynomial. Then, for every $t_0\in\mathbb{P}^1(K)$, there is a punctured neighbourhood U_{t_0} of t_0 such that, for all $t\in U_{t_0}$, the value of $P(t)\bmod(K_v^*)^n$ depends only on $(t-t_0)\bmod(K_v^*)^n$. (If $t_0=\infty$, read $1/t$ instead of $t-t_0$.)*

Proof. If two polynomials P_1 and P_2 satisfy the conclusion, so does their product $P_1\cdot P_2$. We can hence assume that P is irreducible.

We can also assume that we are looking at points t_0 with $v(t_0)\geq 0$: to look at t_0 with $v(t_0)<0$ (or at $t_0=\infty$), replace $P(t)$ by $P(1/t)\cdot t^{rn}$, where r is the least integer such that $rn\geq\deg(P)$.

If P is a constant, then what we seek to prove is trivially true.

Assume now that $P\in K_v[t]$ is linear, i.e., of degree 1. Then $P(t)=at+b$, $a,b\in K_v$. The value of $P(t)$ mod $(K_v^*)^n$ will depend only on $t-t_0$ mod $(K_v^*)^n$ for $t_0=-b/a$. At all points other than $t_0=-b/a$, the function $t\to P(t)\bmod(K_v^*)^n$ is locally constant.

Assume, lastly, that $P\in K_v[t]$ is an irreducible polynomial of degree 2 or more. By Hensel's lemma, there is an integer k such that $v(P(t))\leq k$ for all $t\in K_v$ with $v(t)\geq 0$. (If $v(P(t))$ is too large, Hensel's lemma states that there is a root of $P(t)$ in K_v near t, and so P would not be irreducible over K_v.) Again by Hensel's lemma, there is an integer ℓ such that $1 + x \in (K^*)^n$ for all $x \in K_v$ with $v(x) \geq \ell$. Let $t_0 \in K_v$ satisfy $v(t_0) \geq 0$. Since $t \mapsto P(t)$ is a continuous map, there is a neighbourhood U_{t_0} of t_0 such that $v(t - t_0) \geq \ell + k$ for all $t \in U_{t_0}$. By the preceding discussion, $P(t) \bmod (K_v^*)^n$ is constant on U_{t_0}. □

Corollary 5.6. *Let K_v be a local field. Let n be a positive integer; assume either $\mathrm{char}(K_v) = 0$ or $n \nmid \mathrm{char}(K_v)$. Let g be a complex-valued function on $\mathbb{P}^1(K_v)$ of the form*

$$g(t) = g_1(P_1(t), Q_1(t)) \cdot g_2(P_2(t), Q_2(t)) \cdot \dots \cdot g_r(P_r(t), Q_r(t)),$$

where each g_j is a function from $K_v^*/(K_v^*)^n \times K_v^*/(K_v^*)^n$ to $\mathbb{C}$, and $P_j, Q_j \in \mathscr{O}_{K,V}[t]$ are non-zero.

Then, around each $t_0 \in \mathbb{P}^1(K_v)$, there is a punctured neighbourhood U_{t_0} such that, for all $t \in t_0$, $g(t)$ depends only on $(t - t_0) \bmod (K^*)^n$. (If $t_0 = \infty = \mathbb{P}^1(K_v)$, read $1/t$ instead of $t - t_0$.)

Proof. Apply Lemma 5.5 to each P_j and each Q_j. □

Corollary 5.7. *Let K_v be a local field. Let n be a positive integer; assume either $\mathrm{char}(K_v) = 0$ or $n \nmid \mathrm{char}(K_v)$. Let g be a complex-valued function on $\mathbb{P}^1(K_v)$ of the form*

$$g(t) = g_1(P_1(t), Q_1(t)) \cdot g_2(P_2(t), Q_2(t)) \cdot \dots \cdot g_r(P_r(t), Q_r(t)),$$

where each g_j is a function from $K_v^*/(K_v^*)^n \times K_v^*/(K_v^*)^n$ to $\mathbb{Q}$, and $P_j, Q_j \in \mathscr{O}_{K,V}[t]$ are non-zero.

Then, for every ball U in K_v,

$$\int_U g(t)dt$$

is a rational number.

Proof. Immediate from Corollary 5.6 and Lemma 4.9. □

5.4.2. *Lemmas on integration in two variables.*

Lemma 5.8. *Let K_v be a local field. Let n be a positive integer; assume either $\mathrm{char}(K_v) = 0$ or $n \nmid \mathrm{char}(K_v)$. Let $P \in K_v[x, y]$ be a non-zero homogeneous polynomial. Let $R = \{(x, y) \in K_v \times K_v : \min(v(x), v(y)) = 0\}$. Let $\pi_r : R \to K_v$ be the map given by $(x, y) \mapsto x/y$.*

Then, for every $t_0 \in \mathbb{P}^1(K_v)$, there is a punctured neighbourhood U_{t_0} of t_0 such that, for all $(x, y) \in \pi_r^{-1}(U_{t_0})$, the value of $P(x, y) \bmod (K_v^*)^n$ depends only on $(x - t_0 y) \bmod (K_v^*)^n$ and $y \bmod (K_v^*)^n$ (or $x \bmod (K_v^*)^n$ and $y \bmod (K_v^*)^n$ if $t_0 = \infty$).

Proof. Since P is homogeneous, $Q(x/y) = P(x, y) \cdot y^{-\deg(P)}$ is a polynomial on the variable x/y. Let $t_0 \in \mathbb{P}^1(K_v)$. By Lemma 5.5, there is a punctured neighbourhood U_{t_0} of t_0 such that, for all (x, y) with $\pi_r(x, y) = x/y$ inside U_{t_0}, the value of $Q(x/y) \bmod (K^*)^n$ depends only on $(x/y - t_0) \bmod (K^*)^n$ (or $y/x \bmod (K^*)^n$ if $t_0 = \infty$). Hence the value of $P(x, y) \bmod (K^*)^n = Q(x/y) y^{-\deg(P)} \bmod (K^*)^n$ depends only on $(x/y - y_0) \bmod (K^*)^n$ and $y \bmod (K^*)^n$ (or $y/x \bmod (K^*)^n$ and $y \bmod (K^*)^n$ if $t_0 = \infty$). □

Corollary 5.9. *Let K_v be a local field. Let n be a positive integer; assume either $\mathrm{char}(K_v) = 0$ or $n \nmid \mathrm{char}(K_v)$. Let g be a complex-valued function on $\mathbb{A}^2(K_v)$ of the form*

$$g(x, y) = g_1(P_1(x, y), Q_1(x, y)) \cdot g_2(P_2(x, y), Q_2(x, y)) \cdot \dots \cdot g_r(P_r(x, y), Q_r(x, y)),$$

where each g_j is a function from $K_v^*/(K_v^*)^n \times K_v^*/(K_v^*)^n$ to $\mathbb{C}$, and $P_j, Q_j \in K_v[x, y]$ are non-zero and homogeneous. Let $\pi_r : R \to K_v$ be the map given by $(x, y) \mapsto x/y$.

Then, for every $t_0 \in \mathbb{P}^1(K_v)$*, there is a punctured neighbourhood* U_{t_0} *of* t_0 *such that, for all* $(x,y) \in \pi_r^{-1}(U_{t_0})$*, the value of* $P(x,y) \bmod (K_v^*)^n$ *depends only on* $(x - t_0 y) \bmod (K_v^*)^n$ *and* $y \bmod (K_v^*)^n$ *(or* $x \bmod (K_v^*)^n$ *and* $y \bmod (K_v^*)^n$ *if* $t_0 = \infty$*).*

Proof. Apply Lemma 5.8 to each P_j and each Q_j. □

Corollary 5.10. *Let* K_v *be a local field. Let* n *be a positive integer; assume either* $\mathrm{char}(K_v) = 0$ *or* $n \nmid \mathrm{char}(K_v)$*. Let* g *be a complex-valued function on* $\mathbb{A}^2(K_v)$ *of the form*

$$g(x,y) = g_1(P_1(x,y), Q_1(x,y)) \cdot g_2(P_2(x,y), Q_2(x,y)) \cdot \dots \cdot g_r(P_r(x,y), Q_r(x,y)),$$

where each g_j *is a function from* $K_v^*/(K_v^*)^n \times K_v^*/(K_v^*)^n$ *to* $\mathbb{Q}$*, and* $P_j, Q_j \in K_v[x,y]$ *are non-zero and homogeneous.*

Let $R = \{(x,y) \in K_v \times K_v : \min(v(x), v(y)) = 0\}$*. Then, for any balls* $U_1, U_2 \subset K_v$*,*

$$\int_{R \cap (U_1 \times U_2)} f(x,y)\, dx\, dy$$

is a rational number.

Proof. Let $\pi_r : R \to K_v$ be the map given by $(x,y) \mapsto x/y$. We can cover $\mathbb{P}^1(K_v)$ by neighbourhoods $U_{t_0} \cup \{t_0\}$, where U_{t_0} is as in Cor. 5.9, and then refine this covering into a partition of $\mathbb{P}^1(K_v)$ into a finite number of balls $U_{t_0} \cup \{t_0\}$. It is enough to show that

$$\int_{\pi_r^{-1}(U_{t_0}) \cap (U_1 \times U_2)} f(x,y) dx dy \tag{5.15}$$

is rational for one such ball U_{t_0}. We can assume without loss of generality that $v(t_0) \geq 0$, and, in particular, that $t_0 \neq \infty$. (If $v(t_0) < 0$, switch the variables x and y.) We can also assume that $v(t) = v(t_0)$ for all $t \in U_{t_0}$. (Make all neighbourhoods U_{t_0} small enough at the beginning.)

As in the proof of Lemma 4.9, it is enough to show that the area of each set of the form $\pi_r^{-1}((t_0 + g(K^*)^n) \cap U_{t_0}) \cap (U_1 \times U_2)$ is rational. We can assume that U_{t_0} is small enough for $U_{t_0} \cdot U_1$ to be equal to $t_0 \cdot U_1$. (For this to be true, it is enough that the radius of U_{t_0} be smaller than the radius of U_1.) Either the ball $t_0 \cdot U_1$ is disjoint from U_2 (and we are done), or $t_0 \cdot U_1$ is contained in U_2 (and we replace U_1 by $t_0^{-1} U_2$) or $t_0^{-1} \cdot U_2$ is contained in U_1 (and we replace U_2 by $t_0 U_2$). In any of these cases, we have that it is enough to show that

$$\mathrm{Area}(\pi_r^{-1}((t_0 + g(K^*)^n) \cap U_{t_0}) \cap (U_1 \times K_v))$$

is rational.

If $v(t_0) > 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathrm{Area}(\pi_r^{-1}((t_0 + g(K^*)^n) \cap U_{t_0}) \cap (U_1 \times K_v))\\ &\quad= \mathrm{Area}((t_0 + g(K^*)^n) \cap U_{t_0}) \cdot \mathrm{Area}(U_1 \cap \{x \in K_v : v(x) \geq 0\}).\end{aligned}$$

If

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathrm{Area}(\pi_r^{-1}((t_0 + g(K^*)^n) \cap U_{t_0}) \cap (U_1 \times K_v))\\ &\quad= \mathrm{Area}((t_0 + g(K^*)^n) \cap U_{t_0}) \cdot \mathrm{Area}(U_1 \cap \{x \in K_v : v(x) > 0\}).\end{aligned}$$

Both $U_1 \cap \{x \in K_v : v(x) \geq 0\}$ and $U_1 \cap \{x \in K_v : v(x) > 0\}$ are unions of finitely many disjoint balls, and thus they have rational areas. We show as in the proof of Lem. 4.9 that $\mathrm{Area}((t_0 + g(K^*)^n) \cap U_{t_0})$ is rational, and we are done. □

Corollary 5.7 and 5.10 will all be useful when we determine the average root number for those rare families where it is not zero.

6. The shape of the global root number

6.1. **Outline.** Let $\mathscr{E}$ be an elliptic curve over $K(T)$, where $\mathscr{E}$ is a global field. For simplicity, say $K = \mathbb{Q}$. Let $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}$. We can write the root number of $\mathscr{E}(x/y)$ as follows:

$$W(\mathscr{E}(x/y)) = -\prod_p W_p(\mathscr{E}(x/y)),$$

where $W_p(\mathscr{E}(x/y))$ is the local root number at p.

Local root numbers will be described explicitly in Prop. 6.1. As one can see there, the most interesting case happens when $\mathscr{E}(x/y)$ multiplicative reduction at p; the local root number at p is then

$$W_p(\mathscr{E}(x/y)) = -\left(\frac{-c_6(x/y)}{p}\right),$$

where c_6 is one of the parameters describing $\mathscr{E}$ in the standard fashion. (See §6.2.1.) The local root numbers at places of non-multiplicative reduction are dull in comparison.

Thus, $W(\mathscr{E}(x/y))$ equals something dull times

$$\prod_{\substack{p \\ \mathscr{E}(x/y) \text{ has mult.} \\ \text{reduction at } p}} W_p(\mathscr{E}(x/y)) = \prod_{\substack{p \\ \mathscr{E}(x/y) \text{ has mult.} \\ \text{reduction at } p}} \left(-\left(\frac{-c_6(x/y)}{p}\right)\right), \tag{6.1}$$

Now, the set of primes at which $\mathscr{E}(x/y)$ has multiplicative reduction is more or less the same (though not quite the same!) as the set of primes dividing $M_{\mathscr{E}}(x,y)$, where $M_{\mathscr{E}} \in \mathbb{Z}[X,Y]$ is the product of the polynomials corresponding to the places v of $K(T)$ where $\mathscr{E}$ has multiplicative reduction. Hence (6.1) equals

$$\begin{aligned}\text{dull} \cdot \prod_{p|M_{\mathscr{E}}(x,y)} \left(-\left(\frac{-c_6(x/y)}{p}\right)\right) &= \text{dull} \cdot \lambda(M_{\mathscr{E}}(x,y)) \cdot \prod_{p|M_{\mathscr{E}}(x,y)} \left(\frac{-c_6(x/y)}{p}\right) \\ &= \text{dull} \cdot \lambda(M_{\mathscr{E}}(x,y)) \cdot \left(\frac{-c_6(x/y)}{M_{\mathscr{E}}(x,y)}\right),\end{aligned} \tag{6.2}$$

where $\lambda(n) = \prod_{p|n}(-1)^{v_p(n)}$ is the Liouville function.

We proved in §5 that quadratic reciprocity symbols are dull. Thus,

$$\text{dull} \cdot \lambda(M_{\mathscr{E}}(x,y)) \cdot \left(\frac{-c_6(x/y)}{M_{\mathscr{E}}(x,y)}\right) = \text{dull} \cdot \lambda(M_{\mathscr{E}}(x,y)).$$

Therefore

$$W(\mathscr{E}(x/y) = \text{dull} \cdot \lambda(M_{\mathscr{E}}(x,y)).$$

This is the gist of Theorem 6.6, the main result in this section.

6.2. **Preliminaries.**

6.2.1. *Valuative criteria for reduction type.* Let K_v be a Henselian field whose residue field has characteristic neither 2 nor 3. Let E be an elliptic curve over K_v. Let $c_4, c_6 \in K_v$ be a set of parameters describing E. As is usual, define the *discriminant* Δ of (the given model of) E to be

$$\Delta = \frac{c_4^3 - c_6^2}{1728}.$$

Then the reduction of E at v will be

- *good* if $v(c_4) \geq 4k$, $v(c_6) \geq 6k$, $v(\Delta) = 12k$ for some integer k;
- *multiplicative* if $v(c_4) = 4k$, $v(c_6) = 6k$, $v(\Delta) > 12k$ for some integer k;

- *additive* and *potentially multiplicative* if $v(c_4) = 4k+2$, $v(c_6) = 6k+3$ and $v(\Delta) > 12k+6$ for some integer k;
- *additive* and *potentially good* in all remaining cases.

It is easy to derive these criteria for reduction type from, say, [36], Prop. VII.5.1; all we need is a minimal model for E. We can find such a model as follows. Let $\pi \in \mathscr{O}_{K_v}$ be a uniformiser for K_v, i.e., an element of K_v such that $v(\pi) = 1$. Let $k = \min\left(\left\lfloor \frac{v(c_4)}{4} \right\rfloor, \left\lfloor \frac{v(c_6)}{6} \right\rfloor\right)$. Since the characteristic of K_v is $\neq 2, 3$, the equation $y^2 = x^3 - 27 c_4 \pi^{-4k} x - 54 c_6 \pi^{-6k}$ describes an elliptic curve with c_4- and c_6-parameters equal to $6^4 \pi^{-4k} c_4$ and $6^6 \pi^{-6k} c_6$, respectively. Since the residue field characteristic of K_v is also $\neq 2, 3$, the valuations of these parameters are $v(6^4 \pi^{-4k} c_4) = v(c_4) - 4k$ and $v(6^6 \pi^{-6k} c_6) = v(c_6) - 6k$. By the definition of k, either $v(c_4) - 4k < 4$ or $v(c_6) - 6k < 6$. Thus, the equation $y^2 = x^3 - 27 c_4 \pi^{-4k} - 54 c_6 \pi^{-6k}$ provides a minimal model for E. Now apply [36], Prop. VII.5.1.

We will say that a curve with bad reduction has *half bad* reduction if a quadratic twist of the curve in question has good reduction; we will say it has *quite bad* reduction if no quadratic twist has good reduction. It is simple to see that the reduction is *half bad* exactly when $v(c_4) \geq 4k+2$, $v(c_6) \geq 6k+3$ and $v(\Delta) = 12k+6$ for some integer k.

6.2.2. *Local root numbers for* $\mathfrak{p} \nmid 2, 3$. *Local root numbers at infinite places.* Recall that we write $(\cdot/\mathfrak{p})$ for the quadratic reciprocity symbol on $(K_\mathfrak{p}^*$; see (5.8).

Proposition 6.1. *Let K be a global field. Let $\mathfrak{p}$ be a prime of K such that* $\mathrm{char}(K_\mathfrak{p}/\mathfrak{p}K_\mathfrak{p}) \neq 2, 3$. *Let E be an elliptic curve over K. If the reduction of E at $\mathfrak{p}$ is good, then $W_\mathfrak{p}(E) = 1$. If the reduction of E at $\mathfrak{p}$ is additive and potentially good, then*

(a) $W_\mathfrak{p}(E) = (-1/\mathfrak{p})$ *if $v_\mathfrak{p}(\Delta(E))$ is even but not divisible by four,*
(b) $W_\mathfrak{p}(E) = (-2/\mathfrak{p})$ *if $v_\mathfrak{p}(\Delta(E))$ is odd and divisible by three,*
(c) $W_\mathfrak{p}(E) = (-3/\mathfrak{p})$ *if $v_\mathfrak{p}(\Delta(E))$ is divisible by four but not by three.*

If the reduction of E at $\mathfrak{p}$ is additive and potentially multiplicative, then

$$W_\mathfrak{p}(E) = (-1/\mathfrak{p}). \tag{6.3}$$

If the reduction is multiplicative and c_6 is the parameter from any Weierstrass model of E, then $W_\mathfrak{p}(E) = -1$ when $-c_6 \in (K_\mathfrak{p}^*)^2$ and $W_\mathfrak{p}(E) = 1$ when $-c_6 \notin (K_\mathfrak{p}^*)^2$. In other words, when the reduction is multiplicative,

$$W_\mathfrak{p}(E) = -(-c_6/\mathfrak{p}). \tag{6.4}$$

Proof. The formulae for good and multiplicative reduction are classical; see, e.g., parts (i) and (ii) of the Proposition in [31], §19. The case of multiplicative reduction was put in the form (6.4) in [5, Lemma 2.2] (but similar expressions were known before).

The formulae for additive reduction are proved in [30, Prop. 2–3], when $K = \mathbb{Q}$, and in [32, Prop. 2(iii)] for K a number field. (Apply [32, Prop. 2(iii)] with τ equal to the trivial (one-dimensional) complex representation.) Rohrlich's arguments rest on older work (see [7]) valid for local fields of any characteristic, and his proofs are general enough to carry over to all local fields $K_\mathfrak{p}$ with residue characteristic $\neq 2, 3$. See the discussion in the proof of [5], Thm. 3.1. □

Recall that, for us, a global field is either a number field or a function field over a finite field. In the following proposition, we assume that K is a number field, as opposed to any global field, simply because function fields have no infinite places.

Proposition 6.2. *Let K be a number field. Let E be an elliptic curve over K. Let v be an infinite place of K. Then*

$$W_v(E) = -1.$$

Proof. See [31, §20]. □

6.2.3. *Notation.* Henceforth K will be a global field of characteristic neither 2 nor 3. Fix a finite, non-empty set of places V of K including all archimedean places. Let $\mathscr{E}$ be an elliptic curve over $K(T)$ given by $c_4, c_6 \in K(T)$. The parameters $c_4, c_6 \in K(T)$ give us the discriminant $\Delta = \frac{1}{1728}(c_4^3 - c_6^2) \in K(T)$.

Define $M_{\mathscr{E}}, B_{\mathscr{E}} \in \mathscr{O}_{K,V}[x,y]$ as in (2.1). (They are the products of the polynomials corresponding to the places of $K(T)$ where $\mathscr{E}$ has multiplicative or quite bad reduction, respectively.) We will henceforth let $(a|b)_{\mathfrak{d}}$ be as in (5.7). (Essentially, $(a|b)_{\mathfrak{d}}$ is a quadratic-reciprocity symbol that ignores the contributions of the prime ideals dividing $\mathfrak{d}$.)

Let $\mathscr{P}$ be the set of all places w of $K(T)$ such that $w(c_4) \neq 0$, $w(c_6) \neq 0$ or $w(\Delta) \neq 0$. We can write

$$\begin{aligned} c_4(x/y) &= \frac{d_0}{d_1} \prod_{w : w(c_4) \neq 0} (P_w(x,y))^{w(\Delta)} \\ c_6(x/y) &= \frac{d_2}{d_3} \prod_{w : w(c_6) \neq 0} (P_w(x,y))^{w(\Delta)} \\ \Delta(x/y) &= \frac{d_4}{d_5} \prod_{w : w(\Delta) \neq 0} (P_w(x,y))^{w(\Delta)}, \end{aligned} \tag{6.5}$$

for some $d_0, d_1, d_2, d_3, d_4, d_5 \in \mathscr{O}_{K,V}$, where P_w is the homogeneous polynomial corresponding to w (see §2.1.1). Let $\mathfrak{d}_{\mathscr{E}} \in I_{K,V}$ be the principal ideal generated by

$$2 \cdot 3 \cdot d_0 d_1 d_2 d_3 d_4 d_5 \cdot \prod_{\substack{w_1, w_2 \in \mathscr{P} \\ w_1 \neq w_2 \\ \mathscr{E} \text{ has bad red. at } w_1,\, w_2}} \operatorname{Res}(P_{w_1}, P_{w_2}). \tag{6.6}$$

One may say that $\mathscr{P}$ is the set of interesting places of $K(T)$, whereas $\mathfrak{d}_{\mathscr{E}}$ is the product of the prime ideals corresponding to the interesting places of K.

6.3. **The contribution of a place of $K(T)$ to $W(\mathscr{E}(t))$.** Let w be a place of $K(T)$. It is natural to define $W_{\mathscr{E},\mathfrak{d},w}(x,y) = \prod_{\mathfrak{p}\nmid\mathfrak{d} : \mathfrak{p}|P_w(x,y)} W_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mathscr{E}(x/y))$, which may be thought of as the contribution to $W(\mathscr{E}(x/y)) = \prod_v W_v(\mathscr{E}(x/y))$ coming from the place w of $K(T)$. (Here and henceforth, the variable $\mathfrak{p}$ in a product $\prod_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is understood to range over the prime ideals of $\mathscr{O}_{K,V}$.)

Proposition 6.3. *Let K be a global field of characteristic $\neq 2, 3$; fix a finite, non-empty set of place V of K including all of the infinite places. Let $\mathscr{E}$ be an elliptic curve over $K(T)$. Let w be a place of $K(T)$. Let $\mathfrak{d} \in I_{K,V}$ be any ideal divisible by $\mathfrak{d}_{\mathscr{E}}$.*

Then, for all $x, y \in \mathscr{O}_{K,V}$ with x/y outside a finite set of values and $\gcd(x,y) | \mathfrak{d}^\infty$,

$$W_{\mathscr{E},\mathfrak{d},w}(x,y) = \begin{cases} g(x,y) \cdot h(x,y) \cdot \lambda(P_w(x,y)) & \textit{if } \mathscr{E} \textit{ has multiplicative reduction at } w, \\ g(x,y) \cdot h(x,y) & \textit{otherwise,} \end{cases} \tag{6.7}$$

where

(a) *λ is the Liouville function,*
(b) *$g(x,y)$ is of the form*

$$g(x,y) = g_1(P_1(x,y), Q_1(x,y)) \cdot g_2(P_2(x,y), Q_2(x,y)) \cdot \dots \cdot g_k(P_k(x,y), Q_k(x,y)), \tag{6.8}$$

where each v_j is a place of K, g_j is a function from $K_{v_j}^*/(K_{v_j}^*)^2 \times K_{v_j}^*/(K_{v_j}^*)^2$ to $\{-1, 1\}$, and $P_j, Q_j \in \mathscr{O}_{K,V}[x,y]$ are non-zero and homogeneous, and

(c) *$h(x,y)$ is of the form*

$$h(x,y) = \prod_{\substack{\mathfrak{p}\nmid\mathfrak{d} \\ \mathfrak{p}^2|P_w(x,y)}} h_{\mathfrak{p}}(c_6(x/y), P_w(x,y)), \tag{6.9}$$

where $h_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is a function from $K_{\mathfrak{p}}^*/(K_{\mathfrak{p}}^*)^2 \times K_{\mathfrak{p}}^*/(K_{\mathfrak{p}}^*)^{12}$ to $\{-1,1\}$.

If the reduction of $\mathscr{E}$ at w is half-bad, then $h(x,y)=1$ for all values of x and y. If the reduction of $\mathscr{E}$ at w is good, then $g(x,y)=1$ and $h(x,y)=1$ for all values of x and y.

Remark. Recall that $P_w \in \mathscr{O}_{K,V}[x,y]$ is defined to be a homogeneous polynomial corresponding to a place w of $K(T)$. For $g_j(P_j(x,y),Q_j(x,y))$ to be well-defined, the values $P_j(x,y)$, $Q_j(x,y)$ must lie in $K_{v_j}^*$; they lie in $K_{v_j}^*$ whenever x/y is outside a finite set of values – in this case, the set of roots of $P_j(t,1)$ and $Q_j(t,1)$. The same goes for $c_6(x/y)$ and $P_w(x,y)$; they lie in $K_{\mathfrak{p}}^*$ whenever x/y is outside a finite set of values.

Proof. Case 1: $\mathscr{E}$ has good reduction at w. By the valuative criterion for good reduction (§6.2.1), we know that $w(c_4)\geq 4k$, $w(c_6)\geq 6k$ and $w(\Delta)=12k$ for some integer k, where we see c_4, c_6 and Δ as elements of $K(T)$. Let $\mathfrak{p}|P_w(x,y)$, $\mathfrak{p}\nmid\mathfrak{d}$. Since $\mathfrak{d}_{\mathscr{E}}|\mathfrak{d}$ and $\gcd(x,y)|\mathfrak{d}$, then, by one of the main properties of the resultant (see §3.3), the ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ cannot divide any $P_{w'}(x,y)$ with $w'\in\mathscr{P}$, $w'\neq w$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
v_{\mathfrak{p}}(c_4(x/y)) &= w(c_4)\cdot v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y)) \geq 4k\cdot v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y)),\\
v_{\mathfrak{p}}(c_6(x/y)) &= w(c_6)\cdot v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y)) \geq 6k\cdot v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y)),\\
v_{\mathfrak{p}}(\Delta(x/y)) &= w(\Delta)\cdot v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y)) = 12k\cdot v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y)).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, again by the criteria in §6.2.1, the elliptic curve $\mathscr{E}(x/y)$ over K has good reduction at $\mathfrak{p}$. Hence $W_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mathscr{E}(x/y))=1$. We thus have

$$W_{\mathscr{E},\mathfrak{d},w}(x,y) = \prod_{\substack{\mathfrak{p}\nmid\mathfrak{d} \\ \mathfrak{p}|P_w(x,y)}} W_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mathscr{E}(x/y)) = 1$$

for all $x,y\in\mathscr{O}_{K,V}$ with $\gcd(x,y)|\mathfrak{d}^\infty$.

Case 2: $\mathscr{E}$ has half-bad reduction at w. By the criterion for half-bad reduction (end of §6.2.1), we know that $w(c_4)\geq 4k+2$, $w(c_6)\geq 6k+3$ and $w(\Delta)=12k+6$ for some integer k. Let $\mathfrak{p}|P_w(x,y)$, $\mathfrak{p}\nmid\mathfrak{d}$. Since $\mathfrak{d}_{\mathscr{E}}|\mathfrak{d}$ and $\gcd(x,y)|\mathfrak{d}$, $\mathfrak{p}$ cannot divide any $P_{w'}(x,y)$ with $w'\in\mathscr{P}$, $w'\neq w$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
v_{\mathfrak{p}}(c_4(x/y)) &= w(c_4)\cdot v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y)) \geq (4k+2)\cdot v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y)),\\
v_{\mathfrak{p}}(c_6(x/y)) &= w(c_6)\cdot v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y)) \geq (6k+3)\cdot v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y)),\\
v_{\mathfrak{p}}(\Delta(x/y)) &= w(\Delta)\cdot v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y)) = (12k+6)\cdot v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y)).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, again by the criteria in §6.2.1, the elliptic curve $\mathscr{E}(x/y)$ over K has half-bad reduction at $\mathfrak{p}$ if $v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y))$ is odd, and good reduction at $\mathfrak{p}$ if $v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y))$ is even. Hence

$$W_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mathscr{E}(x/y)) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y)) \text{ is even,}\\ (-1/\mathfrak{p}) & \text{if } v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y)) \text{ is odd.}\end{cases}$$

Thereby

$$W_{\mathscr{E},\mathfrak{d},w}(x,y) = \prod_{\substack{\mathfrak{p}\nmid\mathfrak{d} \\ \mathfrak{p}|P_w(x,y)}} (-1/\mathfrak{p})^{v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y))} = (-1|P_w(x,y))_{\mathfrak{d}},.$$

where $(a|b)_{\mathfrak{d}}$ is as in (5.7). (Recall that $2|\mathfrak{d}_{\mathscr{E}}$, and so $2|\mathfrak{d}$.) By Cor. 5.3, $(-1|P_w(x,y))_{\mathfrak{d}}$ can be written in the form

$$g_1(P_1(x,y),Q_1(x,y))\cdot g_2(P_2(x,y),Q_2(x,y))\cdot\dots\cdot g_k(P_k(x,y),Q_k(x,y)),$$

where g_j, P_j and Q_j are as in the statement we wish to prove. Set, then, $g(x,y)=(-1|P_w(x,y))_{\mathfrak{d}}$ and $h(x,y)=1$.

Case 3: $\mathscr{E}$ has multiplicative reduction at w. From the criteria for reduction type, we know that $w(c_4)=4k$, $w(c_6)=6k$ and $w(\Delta)>12k$ for some integer k. Let $\mathfrak{p}|P_w(x,y)$, $\mathfrak{p}\nmid\mathfrak{d}$. Since $\mathfrak{d}_{\mathscr{E}}|\mathfrak{d}$ and $\gcd(x,y)|\mathfrak{d}$, the ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ cannot divide any $P_w(x,y)$ with $w\in\mathscr{P}$, $w'\neq w$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
v_{\mathfrak{p}}(c_4(x/y)) &= w(c_4)\cdot v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y)) = 4k\cdot v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y)),\\
v_{\mathfrak{p}}(c_6(x/y)) &= w(c_6)\cdot v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y)) = 6k\cdot v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y)),\\
v_{\mathfrak{p}}(\Delta(x/y)) &= w(\Delta)\cdot v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y)) > 12k\cdot v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y)).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\mathscr{E}(x/y)$ has multiplicative reduction at $\mathfrak{p}$. By Prop. 6.1,

$$W_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mathscr{E}(x/y)) = -(-c_6(x/y)/\mathfrak{p}).$$

Hence (vd. (5.7)),
(6.10)

$$\begin{aligned}
W_{\mathscr{E},\mathfrak{d},w}(x,y) &= \prod_{\substack{p\nmid\mathfrak{d}\\ \mathfrak{p}|P_w(x,y)}} (-(-c_6(x,y)/\mathfrak{p}))\\
&= \prod_{\substack{p\nmid\mathfrak{d}\\ \mathfrak{p}|P_w(x,y)}} (-(-c_6(x,y)/\mathfrak{p}))^{v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y))}\cdot \prod_{\substack{p\nmid\mathfrak{d}\\ \mathfrak{p}^2|P_w(x,y)}} (-(-c_6(x,y)/\mathfrak{p}))^{v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y))-1}\\
&= \prod_{\substack{p\nmid\mathfrak{d}\\ \mathfrak{p}|P_w(x,y)}} (-1)^{v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y))}\cdot(-c_6(x,y)|P_w(x,y))_{\mathfrak{d}}\\
&\cdot \prod_{\substack{p\nmid\mathfrak{d}\\ \mathfrak{p}^2|P_w(x,y)}} (-(-c_6(x,y)/\mathfrak{p}))^{v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y))-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now

$$\prod_{\substack{p\nmid\mathfrak{d}\\ \mathfrak{p}|P_w(x,y)}} (-1)^{v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y))} = \lambda(P_w(x,y))\cdot\prod_{\mathfrak{p}|\mathfrak{d}}(-1)^{v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y))}.$$

It is clear that $\prod_{\mathfrak{p}|\mathfrak{d}}(-1)^{v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y))}$ is of the form (6.8) and

$$\prod_{\substack{\mathfrak{p}\nmid\mathfrak{d}\\ \mathfrak{p}^2|P_w(x,y)}} (-(-c_6(x,y)/\mathfrak{p}))^{v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y))-1}$$

is of the form (6.9). By Cor. 5.3, $(-c_6(x,y)|P_w(x,y))_{\mathfrak{d}}$ is of the form (6.8) as well. Thus, we obtain from (6.10) that $W_{\mathscr{E},\mathfrak{d},w}(x,y)$ is of the form (6.7).

Case 4: $\mathscr{E}$ has additive, potentially multiplicative reduction at w. $w(c_4)=4k+2$, $w(c_6)=6k+3$ and $w(\Delta)>12k+6$ for some integer k. Then, for $\mathfrak{p}|P_w(x,y)$ with $\mathfrak{p}\nmid\mathfrak{d}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
v_{\mathfrak{p}}(c_4(x/y)) &= w(c_4)\cdot v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y)) = (4k+2)\cdot v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y)),\\
v_{\mathfrak{p}}(c_6(x/y)) &= w(c_6)\cdot v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y)) = (6k+3)\cdot v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y)),\\
v_{\mathfrak{p}}(\Delta(x/y)) &= w(\Delta)\cdot v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y)) > (12k+6)\cdot v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y)).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\mathscr{E}(x/y)$ has additive, potentially multiplicative reduction at $\mathfrak{p}$ if $v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y))$ is odd, and multiplicative reduction at $\mathfrak{p}$ if $v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y))$ is even. Hence, by Prop. 6.1,

$$\begin{aligned} W_{\mathscr{E},\mathfrak{d},w}(x,y) &= \prod_{\substack{\mathfrak{p}\nmid\mathfrak{d} \\ \mathfrak{p}|P_w(x,y) \\ v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y)) \text{ odd}}} (-1/\mathfrak{p}) \cdot \prod_{\substack{\mathfrak{p}\nmid\mathfrak{d} \\ \mathfrak{p}|P_w(x,y) \\ v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y)) \text{ even}}} (-(-c_6(x,y)/\mathfrak{p})) \\ &= (-1|P_w(x,y)) \cdot \prod_{\substack{\mathfrak{p}\nmid\mathfrak{d} \\ \mathfrak{p}^2|P_w(x,y) \\ v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y)) \text{ even}}} (-(-c_6(x,y)/\mathfrak{p})). \end{aligned} \tag{6.11}$$

By Cor. 5.3, $(-1/P_w(x,y))$ is of the form (6.8). It is clear that the product in the last line of (6.11) is of the form (6.9).

Case 5: $\mathscr{E}$ has additive, potentially good reduction at w and $\gcd(w(\Delta),12) = 2$. For each $\mathfrak{p} \nmid \mathfrak{d}$, we are in one of three different subcases, depending on $v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y))$:

$$\gcd(v_{\mathfrak{p}}(\Delta(x/y)),12) = \begin{cases} 2 \text{ or } 6 & \text{if } v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y)) \equiv 1,3,5 \bmod 6, \\ 4 & \text{if } v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y)) \equiv 2,4 \bmod 6, \\ 12 & \text{if } v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y)) \equiv 0 \bmod 6. \end{cases}$$

By Prop. 6.1, the three cases result in $W_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mathscr{E}(x/y)) = (-1/\mathfrak{p})$, $W_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mathscr{E}(x/y)) = (-3/\mathfrak{p})$ and $W_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mathscr{E}(x/y)) = 1$, respectively. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} W_{\mathscr{E},\mathfrak{d},w}(x,y) &= \prod_{\substack{\mathfrak{p}\nmid\mathfrak{d} \\ \mathfrak{p}|P_w(x,y)}} (-1/\mathfrak{p})^{v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y))} \cdot \prod_{\substack{\mathfrak{p}\nmid\mathfrak{d} \\ \mathfrak{p}^2|P_w(x,y)}} h_{\mathfrak{p}}(x,y) \\ &= (-1|P_w(x,y))_{\mathfrak{d}} \cdot \prod_{\substack{\mathfrak{p}\nmid\mathfrak{d} \\ \mathfrak{p}^2|P_w(x,y)}} f_{\mathfrak{p}}(v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y))), \end{aligned} \tag{6.12}$$

where $f_{\mathfrak{p}}(a) = (-3/\mathfrak{p})$ if $a \equiv 2,4 \bmod 6$, and $f_{\mathfrak{p}}(a) = 1$ otherwise. By Cor. 5.3, the term $(-1|P_w(x,y))_{\mathfrak{d}}$ is of the form (6.8); it is clear that the product in the last line of (6.12) is of the form (6.9).

Case 6: $\mathscr{E}$ has additive, potentially good reduction at w, and $\gcd(w(\Delta),12) = 3$. As in case 4, we have three possible subcases for each $\mathfrak{p} \nmid \mathfrak{d}$:

$$\gcd(v_{\mathfrak{p}}(\Delta(x/y)),12) = \begin{cases} 3 & \text{if } v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y)) \equiv 1,3 \bmod 4, \\ 6 & \text{if } v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y)) \equiv 2 \bmod 4, \\ 12 & \text{if } v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y)) \equiv 0 \bmod 4. \end{cases}$$

Hence, by Proposition 6.1,

$$W_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mathscr{E}(x/y)) = \begin{cases} (-2/\mathfrak{p}) & \text{if } v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y)) \equiv 1,3 \bmod 4, \\ (-1/\mathfrak{p}) & \text{if } v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y)) \equiv 2 \bmod 4, \\ 1 & \text{if } v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y)) \equiv 0 \bmod 4. \end{cases}$$

Thus

$$W_{\mathscr{E},\mathfrak{d},w}(x,y) = (-2|P_w(x,y))_{\mathfrak{d}} \cdot \prod_{\substack{\mathfrak{p}\nmid\mathfrak{d} \\ \mathfrak{p}^2|P_w(x,y)}} h_{\mathfrak{p}}(v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y))), \tag{6.13}$$

where $h_{\mathfrak{p}}(a) = (-1/\mathfrak{p})$ if $a \equiv 2 \bmod 4$ and $f_{\mathfrak{p}}(a) = 1$ otherwise. The product in (6.13) is of the form (6.9). By Cor. 5.3, $(-2|P_w(x,y))_{\mathfrak{d}}$ is of the form (6.8). *Case 7: $\mathscr{E}$ has additive,* *potentially good reduction at w, and* $\gcd(w(\Delta), 12) = 4$. We have two subcases: Here

$$\gcd(v_{\mathfrak{p}}(\Delta(x/y)), 12) = \begin{cases} 4 & \text{if } v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y)) \equiv 1, 2 \bmod 3, \\ 0 & \text{if } v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y)) \equiv 0 \bmod 3. \end{cases}$$

Hence $W_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mathscr{E}(x/y)) = (-3/\mathfrak{p})$ if $3 \nmid v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y))$ and $W_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mathscr{E}(x/y)) = 1$ if $3 | v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y))$. Thus

$$W_{\mathscr{E},\mathfrak{d},w}(x,y) = (-3|P_w(x,y))_{\mathfrak{d}} \cdot \prod_{\substack{\mathfrak{p} \nmid \mathfrak{d} \\ \mathfrak{p}^2 | P_w(x,y)}} f_{\mathfrak{p}}(v_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_w(x,y))), \tag{6.14}$$

where $f_{\mathfrak{p}}(a) = (-3/\mathfrak{p})$ if $a \equiv 2, 3, 4 \bmod 6$, and $f_{\mathfrak{p}}(a) = 1$ otherwise. The product in (6.14) is of the form (6.9). By Cor. 5.3, $(-3|P_w(x,y))_{\mathfrak{d}}$ is of the form (6.8). □

6.4. **The global root number.** Let us first prove a lemma that will come useful soon.

Lemma 6.4. *Let K be a global field. Let $n > 1$. Assume either* $\mathrm{char}(K) = 0$ *or* $\gcd(n, \mathrm{char}(K)) = 1$.

Let f be a complex-valued function taking values in $\{-1, 1\}$. Suppose that, for every $t_0 \in \mathbb{P}^1(K)$, there is a punctured neighbourhood U_{t_0} of t_0 such that, for $t \in U_{t_0}$, the value of $f(t)$ depends only on $(t - t_0) \bmod (K^*)^n$. (Read $1/t$ instead of $(t - t_0)$ if $t_0 = \infty \in \mathbb{P}^1(K)$.)

Then there are rational functions $R_j \in (K(T))^*$ and functions $g_j : K^*/(K^*)^n \to \{-1, 1\}$ such that

$$f(t) = g_1(R_1(t)) \cdot g_2(R_2(t)) \cdot \cdots \cdot g_k(R_k(t))$$

for all $t \in K$ outside a finite set.

This is the converse of Corollary 5.6.

Proof. We can assume that each U_{t_0} is a punctured ball around t_0. (Otherwise, simply replace each U_{t_0} by a punctured ball around t_0 contained in U_{t_0}.) The neighbourhoods $U_{t_0} \cup \{t_0\}$ are an open cover of $\mathbb{P}^1(K)$. Since $\mathbb{P}^1(K)$ is compact, there is an finite subcover. Given two balls in a non-archimedean field, either they are disjoint or one of them contains the other one. Hence, our open subcover is a partition of $\mathbb{P}^1(K)$. It will thus be enough to construct a function $g : K^*/(K^*)^n \to \{-1, 1\}$ and a rational function $R \in (K(T))^*$ such that $g(R(t)) = f(t)$ for all $t \in U_{t_0}$ and $g(R(t)) = 1$ for all $t \notin U_{t_0} \cup \{t_0\}$. (We can then take the product of all such g for all U_{t_0} in the finite subcover.) We can assume without loss of generality that $t_0 = 0$ and $U_{t_0} = U_0 = \{t \in K^* : v(t) \geq 0\}$. We can also assume that $f(t)$ is not identically 1 on U_0, as otherwise the problem is trivial.

Assume first that $f(t)$ is identically -1 on U_0. Define $g(x) = -1$ for $x \notin (K^*)^n$ and $g(x) = 1$ for $x \in (K^*)^n$. By Hensel's lemma, $(K^*)^n$ is an open subset of K^*; in other words, there is an $\ell > 0$ such that every element of the form $1 + x$, $v(x) \geq \ell$, lies in $(K^*)^n$. Let a be any element of $K^* \setminus (K^*)^n$ with $v(a) < -\ell$. Then $a + x \in K^* \setminus (K^*)^n$ for all $x \in K^*$ with $v(x) \geq 0$. Let k be the least integer such that $kn + v(a) > \ell$. Then $a + t^{kn} \in (K^*)^n$ for all $t \in K^*$ with $v(t) < 0$. Define $R(t) = a + t^{kn}$. We have shown that $f(t) = g(R(t))$ for all $t \in K^*$.

Assume now that $f(t)$ is not identically -1 on U_0. By hypothesis, for all $t \in U_0$, $f(t) = h(t)$, where h is a function from $K^*/(K^*)^n$ to $\{-1, 1\}$. Let $g(t) = h(t^{-1})$; since $f(t)$ is not identically -1 on U_0, $g(t)$ is not identically -1. Let ℓ be as before, i.e., a positive integer such that every element of the form $1 + x$, $v(x) \geq \ell$, lies in $(K^*)^n$. Let a be any element of K^* with $g(a) = 1$ and $v(a) > \ell$. Let k be the least integer such that $kn + 1 > v(a) + \ell$. Then $g(a + 1/t^{kn+1}) = g(a) = 1$ for all t with $v(t) < 0$ and $g(a + 1/t^{kn+1}) = g(1/t^{kn+1}) = h(t^{kn+1}) = h(t)$ for all t with $v(t) \geq 0$. Define $R(t) = a + 1/t^{kn+1}$. We have shown that $f(t) = g(R(t))$ for all $t \in K^*$. □

We finally arrive at one of our main results. It states that the global root number $W(\mathscr{E}(x/y))$ can be expressed as something close to a finite product times $\lambda(M_{\mathscr{E}}(x,y))$.

Proposition 6.5. *Let K be a global field of characteristic $\neq 2,3$. Let $\mathscr{E}$ be an elliptic curve over $K(T)$.*

Fix a finite, non-empty set V of places of K containing all archimedean places; let $\mathfrak{d}_0$ be any non-zero ideal of $\mathscr{O}_{K,V}$. Then, for all $x, y \in \mathscr{O}_{K,V}$ with x/y outside a finite set of values and $\gcd(x,y)|\mathfrak{d}_0^\infty$,

$$W(\mathscr{E}(x/y)) = g(x,y) \cdot h(x,y) \cdot \lambda(M_{\mathscr{E}}(x,y)), \tag{6.15}$$

where

(a) *λ is the Liouville function,*
(b) *$M_{\mathscr{E}}$ and $B_{\mathscr{E}}$, the polynomials corresponding to the places of multiplicative and quite bad reduction, are as in (2.1),*
(c) *$g(x,y)$ is of the form*

$$g(x,y) = g_1(P_1(x,y), Q_1(x,y)) \cdot g_2(P_2(x,y), Q_2(x,y)) \cdot \dots \cdot g_k(P_k(x,y), Q_k(x,y)), \tag{6.16}$$

where v_j is a place of K, g_j is a function from $K_{v_j}^*/(K_{v_j}^*)^2 \times K_{v_j}^*/(K_{v_j}^*)^2$ to $\{-1,1\}$, and $P_j, Q_j \in \mathscr{O}_{K,V}[x,y]$ are non-zero and homogeneous, and

(d) *$h(x,y)$ is of the form*

$$h(x,y) = \prod_{\substack{\mathfrak{p}\nmid\mathfrak{d} \\ \mathfrak{p}^2|B_{\mathscr{E}}(x,y)}} \prod_{\substack{w \\ \mathscr{E} \text{ has q. bad red. at } w}} h_{w,\mathfrak{p}}(c_6(x/y), P_w(x,y)), \tag{6.17}$$

where $h_{w,\mathfrak{p}}$ is a function from $K_{\mathfrak{p}}^*/(K_{\mathfrak{p}}^*)^2 \times K_{\mathfrak{p}}^*/(K_{\mathfrak{p}}^*)^{12}$ to $\{-1,1\}$.

The functions g and h depend on $\mathscr{E}$, K, V and $\mathfrak{d}$.

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{d} = \mathfrak{d}_0\mathfrak{d}_{\mathscr{E}}$, where $\mathfrak{d}_{\mathscr{E}}$ is as in (6.6). By Prop. 6.1, $W_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mathscr{E}(x/y)) = 1$ when $\mathscr{E}(x/y)$ has good reduction at $\mathfrak{p}$. Let $\mathfrak{p} \nmid \mathfrak{d}$ be a prime at which $\mathscr{E}(x/y)$ has bad reduction. Then $v_{\mathfrak{p}}(\Delta(x/y)) \neq 0$, and so, by (6.5), $\mathfrak{p}|P_w(x,y)$ for some place w such that $w(\Delta) \neq 0$. Since $\mathfrak{d}_{\mathscr{E}}|\mathfrak{d}$ and $\gcd(x,y)|\mathfrak{d}$, and $\mathfrak{d}_{\mathscr{E}}$ is defined as a product of resultants (6.6), the ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ cannot divide any $P_{w'}(x,y)$ with $w' \in \mathscr{P}$, $w' \neq w$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} W(\mathscr{E}(x/y)) &= \prod_{v \in V \cup \{\mathfrak{p}:\mathfrak{p}|\mathfrak{d}\}} W_v(\mathscr{E}(x/y)) \cdot \prod_{\substack{\mathfrak{p}\nmid\mathfrak{d} \\ \mathscr{E} \text{ has bad red. at } \mathfrak{p}}} W_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mathscr{E}(x/y)) \\ &= \prod_{v \in V \cup \{\mathfrak{p}:\mathfrak{p}|\mathfrak{d}\}} W_v(\mathscr{E}(x/y)) \cdot \prod_{w : w(\Delta)\neq 0} \prod_{\substack{\mathfrak{p}\nmid\mathfrak{d} \\ \mathfrak{p}|P_w(x,y)}} W_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mathscr{E}(x/y)) \\ &= \prod_{v \in V \cup \{\mathfrak{p}:\mathfrak{p}|\mathfrak{d}\}} W_v(\mathscr{E}(x/y)) \cdot \prod_{w : w(\Delta)\neq 0} W_{\mathscr{E},\mathfrak{d},w}(x,y). \end{aligned} \tag{6.18}$$

The statement now follows from Thm. 4.8, Prop. 6.2 and Lem. 6.4 (applied to the first product in the last line of (6.18)) and from Prop. 6.3 (applied to the second product in the last line of (6.18)). Note that, again by the fact that $\mathfrak{d}_{\mathscr{E}}$ is a product of resultants, the condition $\mathfrak{p}^2|B_{\mathscr{E}}(x,y)$ holds for some $\mathfrak{p} \nmid \mathfrak{d}$ if and only if $\mathfrak{p}^2|P_w(x,y)$ for some place w where $\mathscr{E}$ has quite bad reduction. □

The following is a somewhat less explicit and more readable restatement of Prop. 6.5. It will be quite enough for all of our purposes, including the proofs of the main theorems.

Theorem 6.6. *Let K be a global field of characteristic $\neq 2, 3$. Let $\mathscr{E}$ be an elliptic curve over $K(T)$.*

Fix a finite, non-empty set V of places of K containing all archimedean places; let $\mathfrak{d}_0$ be any non-zero ideal of $\mathscr{O}_{K,V}$. Then, for all $x, y \in \mathscr{O}_{K,V}$ with x/y outside a finite set of values and $\gcd(x, y)|\mathfrak{d}_0^\infty$,

$$W(\mathscr{E}(x/y)) = g(x, y) \cdot h(x, y) \cdot \lambda(M_{\mathscr{E}}(x, y)), \tag{6.19}$$

where

(a) *λ is the Liouville function,*

(b) *$M_{\mathscr{E}}$ is the polynomial corresponding to the set of places of multiplicative reduction (see (2.1)),*

(c) *$g(x, y)$ is of the form*
$$g(x, y) = \prod_{v \in S} g_v(x, y),$$
where S is a finite set of places of K and $g_v : K_v \times K_v \to \{-1, 1\}$ is locally constant outside a finite set of lines through the origin in $K_v \times K_v$, and

(d) *$h(x, y)$ is of the form*
$$h(x, y) = \prod_{\mathfrak{p} \notin S} h_{\mathfrak{p}}(x, y),$$
where $h_{\mathfrak{p}} : K_{\mathfrak{p}} \times K_{\mathfrak{p}} \to \{-1, 1\}$ is locally constant outside a finite set of lines through the origin in $K_{\mathfrak{p}} \times K_{\mathfrak{p}}$. The equality $h_{\mathfrak{p}}(x, y) = 1$ holds whenever $\mathfrak{p}^2 | B_{\mathscr{E}}(x, y)$, where $B_{\mathscr{E}}$ is the polynomial corresponding to the set of places of quite bad reduction (see (2.1)).

Remark. The lines through the origin mentioned in (c) are defined over the algebraic closure of K_v; the same is true of the lines in (d) and $K_{\mathfrak{p}}$. Thus, for example, if $K = \mathbb{Q}$ and v is the infinite place of $\mathbb{Q}$, the lines have algebraic slopes (though one may be vertical).

For every $\mathfrak{p} \notin S$ and every ball U in $K_{\mathfrak{p}}$, $\int_U h_{\mathfrak{p}}(x, 1)dx$ is rational. For every finite place $v \in S$ and every ball U in K_v, $\int_U g_v(x, 1)dx$ is rational.

For every finite place v, let $R_v = \{(x, y) \in K_v \times K_v : \min(v(x), v(y)) = 0\}$. Then, for every $\mathfrak{p} \notin S$ and any balls $U_1, U_2 \subset K_v$, the integrals $\int_{R \cup (U_1 \times U_2)} g_{\mathfrak{p}}(x, y)dxdy$ and $\int_{R \cup (U_1 \times U_2)} h_{\mathfrak{p}}(x, y)dxdy$ are rational.

Proof of Theorem 6.6. Immediate from Proposition 6.5 and Lemma 5.4. (A finite number of factors has to be taken from the product defining $h(x, y)$ and included in the product defining $g(x, y)$.) The statements in the remark follow easily from Proposition 6.5 and Corollaries 5.7 and 5.10. □

7. The distribution of the global root number

The time has come to compute averages. From now on, we shall be working with families $\mathscr{E}$ over $\mathbb{Q}(t)$. (A great deal of what follows probably holds just as well for $\mathscr{E}/K(t)$, $K \neq \mathbb{Q}$, under different conventions on how to average functions from K to $\mathbb{C}$. See the comments in §2.4.)

We now know what $W(\mathscr{E}(x/y))$ looks like (Thm. 6.6). Its behaviour as x and y vary depends on the polynomials $B_{\mathscr{E}}$ and $M_{\mathscr{E}}$. If $B_{\mathscr{E}} = 1$ identically, then (§7.2) the function $t \mapsto W(\mathscr{E}(t))$ is a product of finitely many functions each of which is locally constant almost everywhere. Finding the average of such a function (over $\mathbb{Z}$ or over $\mathbb{Q}$) is not particularly hard.

If $B_{\mathscr{E}} \neq 1$, the behaviour of $W(\mathscr{E}(t))$ will be more complex. If $B_{\mathscr{E}} \neq 1$ and $M_{\mathscr{E}}$ is identically 1, then (§7.4) the average of $W(\mathscr{E}(t))$ is not necessarily zero. We will be able to compute this average under the assumption of hypothesis $\mathscr{A}_1(B_{\mathscr{E}}(t,1))$ (if the average is over $\mathbb{Z}$) or $\mathscr{A}_2(B_{\mathscr{E}})$ (if the average is over $\mathbb{Q}$).

Suppose now that $B_{\mathscr{E}} \neq 1$, $M_{\mathscr{E}} \neq 1$ and $K = \mathbb{Q}$. (This is the general case.) Then (§7.6) the average of $W(\mathscr{E}(t))$ is in fact 0. This is our main result. It is conditional on hypotheses $\mathscr{A}_1(B_{\mathscr{E}}(t,1))$ and $\mathscr{B}_1(M_{\mathscr{E}}(t,1))$ (if the average is over $\mathbb{Z}$) or $\mathscr{A}_2(B_{\mathscr{E}})$ and $\mathscr{B}_2(M_{\mathscr{E}})$ (if the average is over $\mathbb{Q}$). We have already discussed (§2.2) the cases in which these hypotheses have already been proved. We shall see some families $\mathscr{E}$ for which the main result is, in consequence, unconditional.

* * *

The same procedure that we use to compute averages can be used to compute autocorrelations, viz.,

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n\leq N} W(\mathscr{E}(n)) \cdot W(\mathscr{E}(n+1)) \tag{7.1}$$

and the like. In particular, if $M_{\mathscr{E}}(t,1)$ is not identically zero, then (7.1) is zero, conditionally on $\mathscr{A}_1(B_{\mathscr{E}}(t,1))$ and $\mathscr{B}_1(M_{\mathscr{E}}(t,1)M_{\mathscr{E}}(t+1,1)))$. It is hard to tell whether expressions such as (7.1) are of any interest; an application might make the difference. We shall not discuss (7.1) further.

7.1. **Averaging finite products.** The following propositions will be very useful for finding the averages of the root numbers in certain special families (§7.2). To deal with other families, we will later prove auxiliary results that are elaborations of the ones here.

Proposition 7.1. *Let S be a finite set of places of $\mathbb{Q}$. For every $v \in S$, let $g_v : \mathbb{Q}_v \to \mathbb{C}$ be a bounded function that is locally constant almost everywhere. Then*

$$\operatorname{av}_{\mathbb{Z}} \prod_{v\in S} g_v(n) = c_\infty \cdot \prod_{p\in S} \int_{\mathbb{Z}_p} g_p(x)dx, \tag{7.2}$$

where, if $\infty \notin S$, then $c_\infty = 1$, and, if $\infty \in S$, then c_∞ is the value $g_\infty(x)$ takes for all x positive and sufficiently large.

Here, as always, “almost everywhere” means “outside a finite set of points”. Thus, in particular, $g_\infty(x)$ is constant for all sufficiently large positive reals x.

In (7.2) as elsewhere, $p \in S$ denotes a finite place of S, i.e., a prime; in other words, the product $\prod_{p\in S}$ ranges over the primes in S.

Proof. Let $|S|$ be the number of elements of S. For $p \in S$, let $S_p \subset \mathbb{Q}_p$ be the finite set of points x in $\mathbb{Q}_p$ at which $g_p(x)$ is not locally constant. We can cover S_p by arbitrarily small balls. In particular, we can cover S_p by disjoint open balls whose union $X_p \subset \mathbb{Z}_p$ has measure $\leq \frac{\epsilon}{|S|}$. Let $R_p = \mathbb{Z}_p \setminus X_p$. (Here X_p stands for “exceptional” and R_p stands for “regular”.) Then, since g_p is bounded,

$$\left| \prod_{v\in S} \int_{\mathbb{Z}_p} g_p(x)dx - \prod_{v\in S} \int_{R_p} g_p(x)dx \right| \leq |S| \cdot \frac{\epsilon}{|S|} \cdot \max_x \prod_{p\in S} g_p(x) = O(\epsilon). \tag{7.3}$$

Let U_p be a ball in the cover of S_p. We can write $U_p = a + p^k\mathbb{Z}_p$ for some $a \in \mathbb{Z}$, $k \geq 0$. Now

$$\sum_{\substack{n\leq N \\ n\equiv a \bmod p^k}} \prod_{v\in S} g_v(n) \ll \sum_{\substack{n\leq N \\ n\equiv a \bmod p^k}} 1 \leq \frac{N}{p^k} + 1 = N \cdot \mu_p(U_p) + 1, \tag{7.4}$$

where μ_p is the measure on $\mathbb{Z}_p$. Let ι_p be the inclusion $\mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}_p$. Let

$$\rho(n) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \iota_p(n) \in R_p \text{ for every } p \in S \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then, thanks to the fact that X_p is the union of the sets U_p in (7.4),

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{n\leq N} (1-\rho(n)) \cdot \prod_{v\in S} g_v(n) \right| &\ll \sum_{\substack{n\leq N \\ \exists p\in S\colon \iota_p(n)\in X_p}} 1 \\ &\leq \sum_{p\in S} (N\cdot \mu_p(X_p) + O(1)) \leq \epsilon \cdot N + o(N), \end{aligned} \tag{7.5}$$

where the implied constants do not depend on N.

By (7.3) and (7.5), what remains to show is that

$$\mathrm{av}_{\mathbb{Z}}\, \rho(n) \cdot \prod_{v\in S} g_v(n) = c_\infty \cdot \prod_{p\in S} \int_{R_p} g_p(x)dx.$$

Since R_p is compact and g_p is locally constant on R_p, we can cover R_p by finitely many balls $U_{p,j}$ on each of which g_p is constant. Given two balls in $\mathbb{Z}_p$, either they are disjoint or one contains the other; hence, we can take the balls $U_{p,j}$ to be disjoint, i.e., we have a partition $R_p = \cup_j U_{p,j}$. It will be enough to show that

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{\substack{n\leq N \\ \forall p\in S: \iota_p(n)\in U_{p,j_p}}} \prod_{v\in S} g_v(n) \right) = c_\infty \cdot \prod_{p\in S} \int_{U_{p,j_p}} g_p(x)dx$$

for every choice of $\vec{j} = \{j_p\}_{p\in S}$. Now, $g_p(x)$ is constant on U_{p,j_p}, and $g_\infty(x) = c_\infty$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ larger than a constant. It remains only to prove

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{\substack{n\leq N \\ \forall p\in S: \iota_p(n)\in U_{p,j_p}}} 1 \right) = \prod_{p\in S} \mu_p(U_{p,j_p}). \tag{7.6}$$

We can write $U_{p,j_p} = a_p + p^{e_p}\mathbb{Z}_p$, $a_p \in \mathbb{Z}$, $e_p \geq 0$. Then $\mu_p(U_{p,j_p}) = p^{-e_p}$, and so

$$\prod_{p\in S} \mu_p(U_{p,j_p}) = \prod_{p\in S} p^{-e_p}.$$

On the other hand, by the Chinese remainder theorem, the integers n such that $\iota_p(n) \in U_{p,j_p}$ for every $p \in S$ form an arithmetic progression of modulus $m = \prod_{p\in S} p^{e_p}$. Hence

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\substack{n\leq N \\ \forall p\in S: \iota_p(n)\in U_{p,j_p}}} 1 = \frac{1}{m} = \prod_{p\in S} p^{-e_p}.$$

We have shown (7.6), and so we are done. □

Remark. The assumptions on g_p in the statement of Prop. 7.1 are stronger than they need to be for the lemma to be true. It would be enough, for example, to assume that $g_p : \mathbb{Q}_p \to \mathbb{C}$ is a bounded function that is continuous outside a set of measure zero. (The condition of boundedness can also be relaxed.) Prop. 7.1 will do for our purposes as is, however.

Let us now examine averages over $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}$. For any function $f : \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{C}$, define

$$\mathrm{av}_{\mathbb{Z}^2,\mathrm{coprime}}\, f(x,y) = \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{\sum_{(x,y)\in[-N,N]^2:\ \gcd(x,y)=1} f(x,y)}{|\{(x,y)\in[-N,N]^2 : \gcd(x,y)=1\}|}. \tag{7.7}$$

The condition of coprimality will be needed in applications: we mean x/y to go over all rational numbers without repetitions. Given a function $f : \mathbb{Q} \to \mathbb{C}$, we define

$$\mathrm{av}_{\mathbb{Q}}\, f(t) = \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{\sum_{(x,y)\in[-N,N]^2:\gcd(x,y)=1, y\neq 0} f(x/y)}{|\{(x,y)\in[-N,N]^2 : \gcd(x,y)=1\}|}. \tag{7.8}$$

This is a special case of the averages $\mathrm{av}_{\mathbb{Q},S\cap L}$ defined in §2, (2.4): we have $\mathrm{av}_{\mathbb{Q}} = \mathrm{av}_{\mathbb{Q},S\cap L}$ for $S = \mathbb{R}^2$, $L = \mathbb{Z}^2$.

Proposition 7.2. *Let S be a finite set of places of $\mathbb{Q}$. For every $v \in S$, let $g_v : \mathbb{Q}_v \times \mathbb{Q}_v \to \mathbb{C}$ be a bounded function that is locally constant outside a finite set of lines through the origin. Then*

$$\mathrm{av}_{\mathbb{Z}^2,coprime} \prod_{v\in S} g_v(x,y) = c_\infty \cdot \prod_{p\in S} \frac{1}{1-p^{-2}} \int_{O_p} g_p(x,y)\, dxdy,$$

where $O_p = (\mathbb{Z}_p \times \mathbb{Z}_p) \setminus (p\mathbb{Z}_p \times p\mathbb{Z}_p)$, $c_\infty = 1$ if $\infty \notin S$, and

$$c_\infty = \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{(2N)^2} \int_{-N}^{N}\int_{-N}^{N} g_\infty(x,y)\, dxdy \tag{7.9}$$

if $\infty \in S$.

Here $1-p^{-2}$ is simply the measure of O_p. (The measure μ_p of $\mathbb{Q}_p$ is, as usual, normalised so that $\mathbb{Z}_p$ has measure $\mu_p(\mathbb{Z}_p) = 1$; then the measure $(\mu_p \times \mu_p)(\mathbb{Z}_p \times \mathbb{Z}_p)$ is 1, and so the measure $(\mu_p \times \mu_p)(O_p)$ of O_p is $1 - p^{-2}$.)

Sketch of proof. The argument is the same as in the proof of Prop. 7.1; let us just remark on the differences.

The exceptional set X_v (v infinite or finite) will consist of small neighbourhoods of the lines through the origin on which g_v is not locally constant. If a line in $\mathbb{Q}_v \times \mathbb{Q}_v$ is of the form $y = ax$, the neighbourhood will be of the form $\{(x,y) : |y/x - a|_v < \epsilon\}$, where ϵ is small. (The neighbourhood of a vertical line will be of the form $\{(x,y) : |x/y|_v < \epsilon\}$.) In other words, the neighbourhoods of the lines will be small angles (or, in the nomenclature we introduced in §3.6, "sectors") containing the lines.

Instead of the Chinese remainder theorem, we use the fact that, given lattice cosets $a_1 + L_1$, $a_2 + L_2$, $a_3 + L_3, \dots, a_n + L_k$ in $\mathbb{Z}^2$ with indices $[\mathbb{Z}^2 : L_1] = p_1^{e_1}$, $[\mathbb{Z}^2 : L_2] = p_2^{e_2}$, $[\mathbb{Z}^2 : L_3] = p_3^{e_3}, \dots, [\mathbb{Z}^2 : L_k] = p_k^{e_k}$ (where $p_1, p_2, p_3, \dots, p_k$ are distinct), the intersection

$$\bigcap_{1\leq j\leq k} (a_j + L_j)$$

is a lattice coset $a + L$ with index $[\mathbb{Z}^2 : L] = \prod_{j\leq k} p_j^{e_j}$.

We also need the (easy) fact that, given a lattice coset $a + L \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$ and a sector $S \subset \mathbb{R}^2$,

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{|S \cap (a+L)|}{(2N)^2} = \frac{1}{[\mathbb{Z}^2 : L]} \cdot \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{|S \cap [-N, N\||}{(2N)^2}. \tag{7.10}$$

□

7.2. **Families of quadratic twists.** Let $\mathscr{E}$ be a family with $B_{\mathscr{E}} = 1$. This implies that $M_{\mathscr{E}} = 1$ as well. Theorem 6.6 then gives us a rather simple expression for $W(\mathscr{E}(x/y))$: the factors $h(x, y)$ and $\lambda(M_{\mathscr{E}}(x, y))$ in (6.19) become identically 1. One can actually obtain an even simpler expression fairly easily by examining this sort of family from scratch. Let us do so.

By the definition of $B_{\mathscr{E}}$ (see (2.1) in §2.1.1), saying that $B_{\mathscr{E}}$ is identically 1 is the same as saying that there is a quadratic twist $\mathscr{E}'$ of $\mathscr{E}$ having good reduction over every place of $K[t]$. A curve $\mathscr{E}'$ over $K[t]$ has good reduction over every place of $K[t]$ if and only if it is in fact a curve over K. Write $\mathscr{E}'$ in the form $y^2 = x^3 + ax + b$, where $a, b \in K$. Then $\mathscr{E}$ is of the form

$$f(t)y^2 = x^3 + ax + b$$

for some polynomial $f \in K[T]$.

Let us start by examining the case $f(t) = t$.

Proposition 7.3. *Let K be a global field of characteristic $\neq 2, 3$. Let E be a fixed elliptic curve given by a Weierstrass equation $y^2 = x^3 + ax + b$, $a, b \in K$. Define*

$$E_t : ty^2 = x^3 + ax + b$$

for $t \in K^*$. Then the root number $W(E_t)$ can be written in the form

$$W(E_t) = \prod_{v \in S} w_v(t), \tag{7.11}$$

where S is a finite set of places of K, and $w_v : K_v^* \to \{-1, 1\}$ is such that $w_v(x)$ depends only on $x(K_v^*)^2 \in (K_v^*)/(K_v^*)^2$.

Note that the factors w_v are *not* the same as the local root numbers W_v. Even here, we will have to use quadratic reciprocity to obtain an expression for the global root number $W(E_t)$ as a finite product.

Proof. For every place v of K and every $s \in K_v^*$, the curves E_t and $E_{s^2 t}$ are isomorphic over K^*. Hence, for every place v, the local root number $W_v(E_t)$ of E_t depends only on the image of t in $K_v^*/(K_v^*)^2$.

Let S be the union of the set of infinite places, the set of primes whose residue fields have char. 2 or 3, and the set of primes dividing the discriminant of $y^2 = x^3 + ax + b$. By what we said, the product $\prod_{v \in S} W_v(E_t)$ depends only on the image of t in $(K_v^*/(K_v^*)^2)_{v \in S}$. It remains to examine $\prod_{v \notin S} W_v(E_t)$.

By Prop. 6.1, $\prod_{\mathfrak{p} \notin S} W(\mathscr{E}(t)) = \prod_{\mathfrak{p} \notin S} (-1/\mathfrak{p})^{v_{\mathfrak{p}}(t)}$. Now

$$\prod_{\mathfrak{p} \notin S} (-1/\mathfrak{p})^{v_{\mathfrak{p}}(t)} = \prod_{\mathfrak{p} \notin S} \left(\frac{t, -1}{\mathfrak{p}}\right) = \prod_{\mathfrak{p} \notin S} \left(\frac{-1, t}{\mathfrak{p}}\right) = \prod_{v \in S} \left(\frac{t, -1}{v}\right),$$

where $\left(\frac{a,b}{v}\right)$ is the quadratic Hilbert symbol. Since $\left(\frac{a,b}{v}\right)$ depends on $a, b \in K_v^*$ only $\operatorname{mod} K_v^{*2}$, the statement follows.

$\square$

Proposition 7.3 actually gives us the behaviour of the root number for any family $\mathscr{E}$ of the form $f(T)y^2 = x^3 + ax + b$: equation (7.11) tells us that

$$W(\mathscr{E}(t)) = W(E_{f(t)}) = \prod_{v \in S} w_v(f(t)). \tag{7.12}$$

This enables us to prove the following.

Corollary 7.4. *Let $\mathscr{E}$ be an elliptic curve over $\mathbb{Q}(T)$ of the form*

$$f(t)y^2 = x^3 + ax + b, \tag{7.13}$$

for some $a, b \in K$, $f \in \mathbb{Q}[T]$. Then

$$\mathrm{av}_{\mathbb{Z}}\, W(\mathscr{E}(t)) = c_\infty \cdot \prod_{p \in S} \int_{\mathbb{Z}_p} w_p(f(t)), \tag{7.14}$$

where S and w_v are as in Prop. 7.3, and c_∞ is the value taken by $w_\infty(f(x))$ for all sufficiently large x. Moreover, the integrals $\prod_p \int_{\mathbb{Z}_p} w_p(f(t))$ are rational numbers.

Since $w_\infty(t)$ depends only on $t \bmod (\mathbb{R}^*)^2 = t \bmod \mathbb{R}^+$, it depends only on the sign $\mathrm{sgn}(t)$ of t. Because $\mathrm{sgn}(f(x))$ is constant for x sufficiently large, it follows that $w_\infty(f(x))$ is equal to a constant c_∞ for all sufficiently large x.

Proof. By Prop. 7.3 and Corollary 5.6, the functions $t \mapsto w_p(f(t))$ are locally constant almost everywhere. Equation (7.14) now follows immediately from Prop. 7.1 and Prop. 7.3. The integrals $\int_{\mathbb{Z}_p} w_p(f(t))$ are rational by Corollary 5.7. □

Corollary 7.5. *Let $\mathscr{E}$ be an elliptic curve over $\mathbb{Q}(T)$ of the form (7.13). Then*

$$\mathrm{av}_{\mathbb{Q}}\, W(\mathscr{E}(x/y)) = c_\infty \cdot \prod_{p \in S} \frac{1}{1 - p^{-2}} \int_{O_p} w_p(f(x/y))dxdy, \tag{7.15}$$

where S and w_v are as in Prop. 7.3, $R_p = \mathbb{Z}_p \times \mathbb{Z}_p \setminus (p\mathbb{Z}_p \times p\mathbb{Z}_p)$, and

$$c_\infty = \lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{1}{(2N)^2} \int_{-N}^{N} \int_{-N}^{N} w_\infty(x/y)dxdy. \tag{7.16}$$

Moreover, the integrals $\prod_p \int_{O_p} w_p(f(t))$ are rational numbers, and c_∞ is an algebraic number.

We define $w_\infty(x) = 1$ for all x if $\infty \notin S$.

Proof. By Prop. 7.3 and Corollary 5.9, the functions $t \mapsto w_p(f(t))$ are locally constant almost everywhere. Hence $(x, y) \mapsto w_\infty(x/y)$ is a locally constant function with values in $\{-1, 1\}$ defined in the complement of a finite set of lines through the origin. Equation (7.15) now follows from Prop. 7.2 and Prop. 7.3.

The integrals $\int_{O_p} w_p(f(x/y))dxdy$ are rational by Corollary 5.10. Note that the lines on whose complement $(x, y) \mapsto w_\infty(x/y)$ is defined are lines with algebraic slopes. (The lines are of the form $x = ry$, where r goes through the roots of $f(r) = 0$.) It follows that the limit (7.16) is an algebraic number. □

Let us finish by showing that a certain phenomenon first noted over $\mathbb{Q}$ ([1]) appears over general global fields as well: a family of quadratic twists can have constant root number.

Corollary 7.6. *Let K be a global field of characteristic $\neq 2, 3$. Let E be an elliptic curve given by a Weierstrass equation $y^2 = x^3 + ax + b$, $a, b \in K$. Let E_t be as in Proposition 7.3. Then there is a polynomial $f \in K[T] \setminus (K[T])^2$ such that $t \mapsto W(E_{f(t)})$ is a constant map on $K \setminus \{$zeroes of f in $K\}$.*

Here $K[T] \setminus (K[T])^2$ is the set of elements of $K[T]$ not in $(K[T])^2$.

Proof. By Proposition 7.3, it will be enough to construct a polynomial $f \in K[T] \setminus (K[T])^2$ such that $f(t) \in K_v^{*2}$ for every $v \in S$ and every $t \in K$ such that $f(t) \neq 0$. (Here S is a finite set of places of K, as in Proposition 7.3.)

Suppose first that K is a function field. We are assuming already that the characteristic of K is not 2. Thus, the residue field characteristic of every localisation K_v of K will be different from 2. Hensel's Lemma then tells us that $f(t)$ is a square in K_v^* if and only if $v(f(t))$ is even and $f(t)\pi^{-v(f(t))}$ is a square in the residue field of K_v. (Here π is any uniformiser of K_v.)

Let p^n be $\max_{v\in S} Nv$, where Nv is the cardinality of the residue field of K_v. Then $t^{p^n-1} \equiv 1 \bmod v$ for every $v \in S$ for which $v(t) = 0$. Assume first that $p \neq 5$. Then $f(t) = 3^2 t^{p^n-1} + 4^2$ is the polynomial we desire: when $v(t) = 0$, the residue of $f(t) \bmod v$ is a square, namely, $3^2 + 4^2 = 5^2$, and $v(f(t))$ is an even number, namely, 0; when $v(t) > 0$, the residue of $f(t)$ is a square, namely, 4^2, and $v(f(t))$ is again 0. When $v(t) < 0$, $v(f(t))$ is the even number $(p^n - 1)v(t)$, and the residue of $f(t)\pi^{-v(f(t))}$ is equal to the residue of $3^2(t \cdot \pi^{-v(t)})^{p^n-1}$, which is a square. Thus, for every $t \in K_v^*$, Hensel's Lemma tells us that $f(t)$ is a square in K_v^*. Consider now the case $p = 5$. We choose $f(t) = (9^2 - 7^2)^2 t^{p^n-1} + (2 \cdot 7 \cdot 9)^2$, and proceed just as for $p \neq 5$.

Suppose now that K is a number field. Define $m = 2^k 5^4 \cdot \prod_{\mathfrak{p}\in S}(N\mathfrak{p}-1)$, where we choose the positive integer k to be large enough for the following argument to work. Define $f(t) = 3^2 t^m + 4^2$. Then, for every non-archimedean place v whose residue field characteristic is not 2, 3 or 5, the value $f(t)$ is a square in K_v^* for every $t \in K$, by the argument used in the function-field case. The same argument works for residue field characteristic 5, and – provided that $k > 1$ – for characteristic 3 as well. In the case of v with residue field characteristic 2, Hensel's lemma tells us that $x \in K_v^*$ is a square whenever $v(x)$ is even and $x\pi^{-v(x)}$ is a square modulo $\mathfrak{p}^3$, where π is a uniformiser of v and $\mathfrak{p}$ is the prime ideal of v. Since $2^k | m$, we can ensure that $t^m \pi^{-v(t^m)} = (t\pi^{-v(t)})^m \equiv 1 \bmod \mathfrak{p}^l$ for l arbitrarily high by setting k sufficiently large. If $K = \mathbb{Q}$, then $l = 7$ is large enough for $t^m \pi^{-v(t^m)} \equiv 1 \bmod \mathfrak{p}^l$ to imply $f(t) \equiv 1 \bmod \mathfrak{p}^3$; in general, $l = 7\deg(K/\mathbb{Q})$ is certainly sufficiently large. We set k high enough for us to obtain this l, and conclude that $f(t)$ is then a square in K_v^*. It remains to check the archimedean places. For v real, $f(t) = 3^2 t^m + 4^2$ is always positive, and hence a square in $\mathbb{R}$. Every number is a square in $\mathbb{C}$, and so $f(t) \in K_v^{*2}$ for v complex. □

7.3. **Averaging almost-finite products.** The following propositions will be needed when we find the averages of the root numbers of families that are not simply quadratic twists of a fixed curve, yet lack multiplicative reduction.

Recall that, when we write **Lemma 0.0**($\mathscr{X}(P)$), we mean that the lemma is conditional on hypothesis $\mathscr{X}$ for the polynomial $P(t)$. All the hypotheses we shall ever refer to were described in §2.2.

Proposition 7.7 ($\mathscr{A}_1(B)$)**.** *Let S be a finite set of places of $\mathbb{Q}$. For every $v \in S$, let $g_v : \mathbb{Q}_v \to \mathbb{C}$ be a bounded function that is locally constant almost everywhere. For every $p \notin S$, let $h_p : \mathbb{Q}_p \to \mathbb{C}$ be a function that (a) is locally constant almost everywhere, (b) satisfies $|h_p(x)| \leq 1$ for all x.*

Let $B(t) \in \mathbb{Z}[t]$ be a non-zero polynomial. Assume that $h_p(x) = 1$ whenever $v_p(B(x)) < 2$. Let

$$W(n) = \prod_{v\in S} g_v(n) \cdot \prod_{p\notin S} h_p(n). \tag{7.17}$$

Then

$$\operatorname{av}_{\mathbb{Z}} W(n) = c_\infty \cdot \prod_{p\in S} \int_{\mathbb{Z}_p} g_p(x)dx \cdot \prod_{p\notin S} \int_{\mathbb{Z}_p} h_p(x)dx, \tag{7.18}$$

where, if $\infty \notin S$, then $c_\infty = 1$, and, if $\infty \in S$, then c_∞ is the value $g_\infty(x)$ takes for all x positive and sufficiently large.

Proof. Let M be a large integer. We know from Prop. 7.1 that

$$\mathrm{av}_{\mathbb{Z}} \prod_{v\in S} g_v(n) \cdot \prod_{\substack{p\notin S \\ p<M}} h_v(n) = c_\infty \cdot \prod_{p\in S} \int_{\mathbb{Z}_p} g_p(x)dx \cdot \prod_{\substack{p\notin S \\ p<M}} \int_{\mathbb{Z}_p} h_p(x)dx, \tag{7.19}$$

since all products in the expression are finite. We must show that each side of (7.19) tends to the corresponding side of (7.18) as $M \to \infty$.

For every p, the number of solutions $t \bmod p^2$ to $B(t) \equiv 0 \bmod p^2$ is bounded independently of p (by Hensel's lemma). Hence, for p fixed, the number of integers $n \leq N$ such that $p^2|B(n)$ is

$$\ll \frac{N}{p^2} + 1.$$

It follows that the number of integers $n \leq N$ such that $p^2|B(n)$ for some p between M and $\sqrt{N}$ (inclusive) is

$$\ll \sum_{M\leq p\leq\sqrt{N}} \frac{N}{p^2} + \sum_{M\leq p\leq\sqrt{N}} 1 \ll \frac{N}{M} + \sqrt{N} = \frac{N}{M} + o(N).$$

By hypothesis $\mathscr{A}_1(B(t))$, the number of integers $n \leq N$ such that $p^2|B(n)$ for some $p > \sqrt{N}$ is $o(N)$. We conclude that the number of integers $n \leq N$ such that $p^2|B(n)$ for some $p > M$ is

$$O\left(\frac{N}{M}\right) + o(N).$$

Since $h_p(n) = 1$ for all p such that $p^2 \nmid B(n)$, it follows that

$$\left| \sum_{n\leq N} \prod_{v\in S} g_v(n) \cdot \prod_{p\notin S} h_v(n) - \sum_{n\leq N} \prod_{v\in S} g_v(n) \cdot \prod_{\substack{p\notin S \\ p<M}} h_v(n) \right| = O\left(\frac{N}{M}\right) + o(N),$$

and so

$$\left| \mathrm{av}_{\mathbb{Z}} W(n) - av_{\mathbb{Z}} \left(\prod_{v\in S} g_v(n) \cdot \prod_{\substack{p\notin S \\ p<M}} h_v(n) \right) \right| = O\left(\frac{1}{M}\right).$$

The expression $O(1/M)$ tends to 0 as $M \to \infty$.

Now let us examine the right side of (7.19) and compare it to the right side of (7.18). What we need to show is that

$$\lim_{M\to\infty} \prod_{\substack{p\notin S \\ p\geq M}} \int_{\mathbb{Z}_p} h_p(x)dx = 1. \tag{7.20}$$

Recall that the number of solutions $t \bmod p^2$ to $B(t) \equiv 0 \bmod p^2$ is bounded. Recall also that $|h_p(x)| \leq 1$ for all $x \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ and $h_p(x) = 1$ when $v(B(x)) < 2$. Hence

$$\int_{\mathbb{Z}_p} h_p(x) = 1 - O\left(\frac{1}{p^2}\right).$$

Therefore

$$\prod_{\substack{p\notin S\\ p\geq M}} \int_{\mathbb{Z}_p} h_p(x)dx = \prod_{p\geq M}\left(1 - O\left(\frac{1}{p^2}\right)\right)$$

$$= 1 - O\left(\sum_{m\geq M}\frac{1}{m^2}\right) = 1 - O\left(\frac{1}{M}\right).$$

The expression $1 - O\left(\frac{1}{M}\right)$ tends to 1 as $M \to \infty$. We have shown (7.20), and thus we are done. □

Proposition 7.8 ($\mathscr{A}_2(B)$)**.** *Let S be a finite set of places of $\mathbb{Q}$. For every $v \in S$, let $g_v : \mathbb{Q}_v \times \mathbb{Q}_v \to \mathbb{C}$ be a bounded function that is locally constant outside a finite set of lines through the origin. For every $p \notin S$, let $h_p : \mathbb{Q}_p \times \mathbb{Q}_p \to \mathbb{C}$ be a function that (a) is locally constant outside a finite set of lines through the origin, (b) satisfies $|h_p(x, y)| \leq 1$ for all $x, y \in \mathbb{Q}_p$.*

Let $B \in \mathbb{Z}[x, y]$ be a non-zero homogeneous polynomial. Assume that $h_p(x, y) = 1$ whenever $v_p(B(x, y)) < 2$. Let

$$W(x, y) = \prod_{v\in S} g_v(x, y) \cdot \prod_{p\notin S} h_p(x, y).$$

Then

$$\mathrm{av}_{\mathbb{Z}^2,coprime}\, W(x, y) = c_\infty \cdot \prod_{p\in S}\frac{1}{1 - p^{-2}}\int_{O_p} g_p(x, y)\, dxdy \cdot \prod_{p\notin S}\frac{1}{1 - p^{-2}}\int_{O_p} h_p(x, y)\, dxdy,$$

where $O_p = (\mathbb{Z}_p \times \mathbb{Z}_p) \setminus (p\mathbb{Z}_p \times p\mathbb{Z}_p)$, $c_\infty = 1$ if $\infty \notin S$, and

$$c_\infty = \lim_{N\to\infty}\frac{1}{(2N)^2}\int_{-N}^{N}\int_{-N}^{N} g_\infty(x, y)\, dxdy$$

if $\infty \in S$.

Sketch of proof. Proceed just as in the proof of Prop. 7.7 – using Prop. 7.2 instead of Prop. 7.1. Rather than the fact that the number of solutions $t \bmod p^2$ to $P(t) \equiv 0 \bmod p^2$ (P a non-zero polynomial) is bounded independently of p, we need the fact that the solutions $(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ to $P(x, y) \equiv 0 \bmod p^2$ (P a non-zero homogeneous polynomial) lie on a bounded number of lattices of index p^2. (Both facts are easy consequences of Hensel's lemma.) □

7.4. **Families without multiplicative reduction.**

In this subsection, we shall consider a family $\mathscr{E}$ of elliptic curves over $\mathbb{Q}$ with $M_{\mathscr{E}} = 1$, i.e., an elliptic curve $\mathscr{E}$ over $\mathbb{Q}(t)$ without any places of multiplicative reduction. We wish to compute the averages

$$\mathrm{av}_{\mathbb{Z}}\, W(\mathscr{E}(t)),\quad \mathrm{av}_{\mathbb{Q}}\, W(\mathscr{E}(t)).$$

The root number $W(\mathscr{E}(t))$ was described in Theorem 6.6. Since $M_{\mathscr{E}}(x, y) = 1$, there is no factor of the form $\lambda(M_{\mathscr{E}}(x, y))$ in (6.19) to give us cancellation. Thus, the averages of $W(\mathscr{E}(x/y))$ will usually be non-zero.

7.4.1. *The average of the root number in families without multiplicative reduction.* Recall that $B_{\mathscr{E}}(x, y)$ is the product of the polynomials corresponding to the places of quite bad reduction, and that $M_{\mathscr{E}}(x, y)$ is the product of the polynomials corresponding to the places of multiplicative reduction. (See (2.1).) We will be examining the case when $M_{\mathscr{E}} = 1$, i.e., the case of families without multiplicative reduction.

If we are looking at averages over $\mathbb{Z}$, we only need $M_{\mathscr{E}}(x,1)=1$ for all x, as opposed to $M_{\mathscr{E}}(x,y)=1$ for all x, y. The families with $M_{\mathscr{E}}(x,1)=1$ for all x are the families that have no places of multiplicative reduction other than, possibly, the place corresponding to the valuation $\deg(\text{den})-\deg(\text{num})$.

Proposition 7.9 ($\mathscr{A}_1(B_{\mathscr{E}}(x,1))$)**.** *Let $\mathscr{E}$ be an elliptic curve over $\mathbb{Q}(T)$. Assume that $\mathscr{E}$ has no places of multiplicative reduction over $\mathbb{Q}(T)$, other than, possibly, the place of $\mathbb{Q}(T)$ corresponding to the valuation* $\deg(\text{den})-\deg(\text{num})$*.*

Then

$$\operatorname{av}_{\mathbb{Z}} W(\mathscr{E}(t)) = c_\infty \cdot \prod_{p\in S} \int_{\mathbb{Z}_p} g_p(x,1)dx \cdot \prod_{p\notin S} \int_{\mathbb{Z}_p} h_p(x,1)dx, \tag{7.21}$$

where S, g_v and h_p are as in Thm. 6.6 and c_∞ is the value taken by $g_\infty(x,1)$ for all sufficiently large x. Moreover, the integrals $\int_{\mathbb{Z}_p} g_p(x,1)dx$ and $\int_{\mathbb{Z}_p} h_p(x,1)dx$ are rational numbers.

Remark. Here as in Prop. 7.7, the infinite product $\prod_{p\notin S}\int_{\mathbb{Z}_p} h_p(x,1)dx$ is absolutely convergent. (In other words, it is like $\prod_p(1-1/p^2)$, not like $\prod_p(1-1/p)$.)

This is so because (as stated in Thm. 6.6) $h_p(x,1)=1$ whenever $p^2 \nmid B_{\mathscr{E}}(x,1)$. For every prime larger than a constant, the congruence $B_{\mathscr{E}}(x,1)\equiv 0 \bmod p^2$ can hold only for $O(1)$ congruence classes $x \bmod p^2$; hence the integral $\int_{\mathbb{Z}_p} h_p(x,1)dx$ is $1+O(1/p^2)$. Thus, the infinite product is absolutely convergent, just like $\prod_p(1+1/p^2)$ or $\prod_p(1-1/p^2)$.

Proof. By Theorem 6.6, the functions $x\mapsto g_v(x,1)$ and $x\mapsto h_p(x,1)$ are locally constant almost everywhere. Moreover, Theorem 6.6 states that $h_p(x)=1$ whenever $v_p(B(x))<2$, and $|h_p(x)|\leq 1$ otherwise. Apply Prop. 7.7. The integrals $\int_{\mathbb{Z}_p} g_p(x,1)dx$ and $\int_{\mathbb{Z}_p} h_p(x,1)dx$ are rational by Cor. 5.7. □

Proposition 7.10 ($\mathscr{A}_2(B_{\mathscr{E}})$)**.** *Let $\mathscr{E}$ be an elliptic curve over $\mathbb{Q}(T)$. Assume that $\mathscr{E}$ has no places of multiplicative reduction over $\mathbb{Q}(T)$.*

Then

$$\operatorname{av}_{\mathbb{Q}} W(x,y) = c_\infty \cdot \prod_{p\in S} \frac{1}{1-p^{-2}} \int_{O_p} g_p(x,y)\, dxdy \cdot \prod_{p\notin S} \frac{1}{1-p^{-2}} \int_{O_p} h_p(x,y)\, dxdy, \tag{7.22}$$

where S, g_v and h_p are as in Thm. 6.6, $O_p=(\mathbb{Z}_p\times\mathbb{Z}_p)\setminus(p\mathbb{Z}_p\times p\mathbb{Z}_p)$, $c_\infty=1$ if $\infty\notin S$, and

$$c_\infty = \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{(2N)^2} \int_{-N}^{N}\int_{-N}^{N} g_\infty(x,y)\, dxdy \tag{7.23}$$

if $\infty\in S$. Moreover, the integrals $\prod_{p\in S}\int_{O_p} g_p(x,y)\, dxdy$, $\prod_{p\notin S}\int_{O_p} h_p(x,y)\, dxdy$ are rational, and c_∞ is an algebraic number.

Remark. Here, much as in Prop. 7.8, the infinite product $\prod_{p\notin S}\int_{O_p} h_p(x,y)\, dxdy$ is absolutely convergent.

Proof. Immediate from Theorem 6.6 and Prop. 7.8.

The integrals $\prod_{p\in S}\int_{O_p} g_p(x,y)\, dxdy$, $\prod_{p\notin S}\int_{O_p} h_p(x,y)\, dxdy$ are rational by Cor. 5.10. The function $g_\infty(x,y)$ is locally constant outside the union of finitely many lines through the origin; by the remark after Theorem 6.6, these lines have algebraic slopes. Since $g_\infty(x,y)$ takes only the values $\{-1,1\}$, the integral (7.23) defining c_∞ is algebraic. □

7.4.2. *Averages over function fields.* The analogues of $\mathscr{A}_1$ and $\mathscr{A}_2$ over function fields are known[4] ([27], [26]). Thus, the function-field analogues of Propositions 7.9 and 7.10 should be unconditional. The most natural ordering here for the purposes of averaging is probably simply the ordering by degree: given a field $K = \mathbb{F}_q(T)$ with integer ring $\mathscr{O} = \mathbb{F}_q[T]$, and given a function $f : K \to \mathbb{C}$, define

$$\mathrm{av}_{\mathscr{O}} f(x) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{q^{n+1}} \sum_{\substack{x\in\mathbb{F}_q[T] \\ \deg(x)\leq n}} f(x)$$

and

$$\mathrm{av}_K f(t) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\sum_{x,y\in\mathbb{F}_q[T]:\, \deg(x),\, \deg(y)\leq n,\, x,\, y \text{ coprime}} f(x/y)}{|\{x, y \in \mathbb{F}_q[T] : \deg(x),\ \deg(y) \leq n,\ x, y \text{ coprime}\}|}.$$

With these definitions, the proofs of the analogues of the results in §7.3 and §7.4 should then go through much as before.

7.5. **Products with cancellation.** The following propositions will be needed when we find the averages of the root numbers of families with multiplicative reduction.

The main ideas of the proofs are already contained in Propositions 7.1 and 7.7, which address a somewhat different situation. We will work in a little more generality than there, in that we will determine averages over arithmetic progressions and over lattices, rather than just over $\mathbb{Z}$ and $\mathbb{Q}$. (We could have done the same there, though essentially the same goal would be fulfilled by a reparametrisation.)

Proposition 7.11 ($\mathscr{A}_1(B)$)**.** *Let S be a finite set of places of $\mathbb{Q}$. For every $v \in S$, let $g_v : \mathbb{Q}_v \to \mathbb{C}$ be a bounded function that is locally constant almost everywhere. For every $p \notin S$, let $h_p : \mathbb{Q}_p \to \mathbb{C}$ be a function that (a) is locally constant almost everywhere, (b) satisfies $|h_p(x)| \leq 1$ for all x. Let $B(t) \in \mathbb{Z}[t]$ be a non-zero polynomial. Assume that $h_p(x) = 1$ whenever $v_p(B(x)) < 2$.*

Let $\alpha : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{C}$ be a function such that

$$\mathrm{av}_{a+m\mathbb{Z}}\ \alpha(n) = 0 \tag{7.24}$$

for every arithmetic progression $a + m\mathbb{Z}$. Assume moreover that $|\alpha(n)| \leq 1$ for all x. Let

$$W(n) = \prod_{v\in S} g_v(n) \cdot \prod_{p\notin S} h_p(n) \cdot \alpha(n). \tag{7.25}$$

Then

$$\mathrm{av}_{a+m\mathbb{Z}} W(n) = 0 \tag{7.26}$$

for every arithmetic progression $a + m\mathbb{Z}$.

Proof. Let M be a large integer. Let $a + m\mathbb{Z}$ be an arithmetic progression. We will show that

$$\mathrm{av}_{a+m\mathbb{Z}} \prod_{v\in S} g_v(n) \cdot \prod_{\substack{p\notin S \\ p<M}} h_p(n) \cdot \alpha(n) = 0.$$

Equation (7.26) will then follow as $M \to \infty$, by the same argument as in Prop. 7.7.

---

[4] The assumption of separability in [27] is made unnecessary by the argument in [26], §7. The same argument suffices to show that there is no contribution from inseparable places to the infinite products below: given an irreducible, inseparable polynomial $f \in F_q[u][t]$, there are only finitely many irreducibles $\pi \in F_q[u]$ such that $\pi^2|f(t)$ has solutions in $F_q[u]$. Various other proofs of the same are possible [6].

We can define $S' = \{S \cup \{p \notin S : p < M\}\}$ and $g_p = h_p$ for $p \in S' \setminus S$. We must prove that

$$\mathrm{av}_{a+m\mathbb{Z}} \prod_{v \in S'} g_v(n) \cdot \alpha(n) = 0.$$

We now proceed as in the proof of Prop. 7.1. For each $p \in S'$, let $S'_p \subset \mathbb{Q}_p$ be the finite set of points of $\mathbb{Q}_p$ at which $g_p(x)$ is not locally constant. We cover S'_p by open balls whose union X_p has measure $\leq \frac{\epsilon}{|S'|}$. We let $R_p = \mathbb{Q}_p \setminus X_p$. (Here R_p stands for "regular set"; it is a set on which $g_p(x)$ is everywhere locally constant.) We define

$$\rho(n) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \iota_p(n) \in R_p \text{ for every } p \in S', \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then, as in the proof of Prop. 7.1,

$$\mathrm{av}_{a+m\mathbb{Z}} \prod_{v \in S'} g_v(n) \cdot \alpha(n) = \mathrm{av}_{a+m\mathbb{Z}}\, \rho(n) \prod_{v \in S'} g_v(n) \cdot \alpha(n) + O(\epsilon).$$

Now R_p is compact, and thus can be covered by finitely many balls $U_{p,j}$ on which g_p is constant. (Since $g_\infty(x) = c_\infty$ for all x larger than a constant, we do not need to worry about what happens at the infinite place $v = \infty$.) It will be enough to show that

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \left(\frac{1}{N/m} \sum_{\substack{n \leq N \\ n \in a+m\mathbb{Z} \\ \forall p \in S' : \iota_p(n) \in U_{p,j_p}}} \prod_{v \in S'} g_v(n) \alpha(n) \right) = 0$$

for every choice of $\vec{j} = \{j_p\}_{p \in S'}$. In other words, we are partitioning the progression $a+m\mathbb{Z}$ into sets of the form $Z_{\vec{j}} \cap (a+m\mathbb{Z})$, where

$$Z_{\vec{j}} = \{n \in \mathbb{Z} : \forall p \in S' \quad \iota_p(n) \in U_{p,j_p}\}$$

for some choice of indices $\vec{j}$, and we would like to see that the average of $g_p(n) \cdot \alpha(n)$ on each such set is 0. Now, $g_p(x)$ is constant on U_{p,j_p}, and so we must just show that

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \left(\frac{1}{N/m} \sum_{\substack{n \leq N \\ n \in Z_{\vec{j}} \cap (a+m\mathbb{Z})}} \alpha(n) \right) = 0 \tag{7.27}$$

for every possible choice of indices $\vec{j}$. As we saw at the end of the proof of Prop. 7.1, the set $Z_{\vec{j}}$ is an arithmetic progression, and hence $(a+m\mathbb{Z}) \cap Z_{\vec{j}}$ is either an arithmetic progression or empty. If it is empty, (7.27) is trivially true; if it is an arithmetic progression, (7.27) is true by the assumption (7.24) that $\alpha(n)$ averages to 0 on every arithmetic progression. □

Given a function $f : \mathbb{Z}^2 \to \mathbb{C}$, a lattice coset $a + L \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$ and a sector $S \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ (see §3.6), we define

$$\mathrm{av}_{S \cap (a+L),\mathrm{coprime}} f = \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{\sum_{(x,y) \in S \cap (a+L) \cap [-N,N]^2 :\ \gcd(x,y)=1} f(x,y)}{|\{(x,y) \in S \cap (a+L) \cap [-N,N]^2 : \gcd(x,y) = 1\}|}. \tag{7.28}$$

This is just like definition (2.3), with the condition $\gcd(x,y) = 1$ added.

Proposition 7.12 ($\mathscr{A}_2(B)$)**.** *Let $\mathscr{S}$ be a finite set of places of $\mathbb{Q}$. For every $v \in \mathscr{S}$, let $g_v : \mathbb{Q}_v \times \mathbb{Q}_v \to \mathbb{C}$ be a bounded function that is locally constant outside a finite set of lines through the origin. For every $p \notin \mathscr{S}$, let $h_p : \mathbb{Q}_p \times \mathbb{Q}_p \to \mathbb{C}$ be a function that (a) is locally constant outside a finite set of lines through the origin, (b) satisfies $|h_p(x,y)| \leq 1$ for all $x, y \in \mathbb{Q}_p$.*

Let $B \in \mathbb{Z}[x,y]$ be a non-zero homogeneous polynomial. Assume that $h_p(x,y) = 1$ whenever $v_p(B(x,y)) < 2$. Let $\alpha : \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{C}$ be a function such that

$$\mathrm{av}_{S\cap(a+L),coprime}\ \alpha(x,y) = 0 \tag{7.29}$$

for every sector S and every lattice coset $a + L$ such that $\{(x,y) \in L : \gcd(x,y) = 1\}$ is non-empty. Assume moreover that $|\alpha(x,y)| \leq 1$ for all x. Let

$$W(x,y) = \prod_{v\in\mathscr{S}} g_v(x,y) \cdot \prod_{p\notin\mathscr{S}} h_p(x,y) \cdot \alpha(x,y).$$

Then

$$\mathrm{av}_{S\cap(a+L),coprime}\, W(x,y) = 0 \tag{7.30}$$

for every sector S and every lattice coset L.

We could remove the word "coprime" from both (7.29) and (7.30); the statement and the proof would still be correct. However, we need the word "coprime" in (7.30) for our applications. After we are done with the proof we are about to go through, we will see how to remove the word "coprime" from (7.29) without removing it from (7.30).

Proof. We will proceed just as in the proof of Prop. 7.11, with the only difference that we shall borrow from Prop. 7.2 rather than from Prop. 7.1.

Let M be a large integer. It will be enough to show that

$$\mathrm{av}_{S\cap(a+L),\mathrm{coprime}} \prod_{v\in\mathscr{S}} g_v(x,y) \cdot \prod_{p\notin\mathscr{S}} h_p(x,y) \cdot \alpha(x,y) = 0.$$

Equation (7.30) will then follow as $M \to \infty$, by the same argument as in Prop. 7.7 or Prop. 7.8.

We can define $\mathscr{S}' = \{\mathscr{S} \cup \{p \notin \mathscr{S} : p < M\}\}$ and $g_p = h_p$ for $p \in \mathscr{S}' \setminus \mathscr{S}$. We must prove that

$$\mathrm{av}_{S\cap(a+L),\mathrm{coprime}} \prod_{v\in\mathscr{S}'} g_v(x,y) \cdot \alpha(x,y) = 0. \tag{7.31}$$

Each function g_v is locally constant outside a finite set of lines in $\mathbb{Q}_v \times \mathbb{Q}_v$. We cover these lines by a set X_v defined as the union of sufficiently narrow sectors (that is, angles) around the lines. The number of integers $-N \leq x, y \leq N$ in an angle ϵ in $\mathbb{R}^2 = \mathbb{Q}_\infty^2$ is $O(\epsilon N^2)$. Hence, if we take care to make each sector of X_∞ of width $\leq \epsilon$,

$$|\{-N \leq x, y \leq N : (x,y) \in X_\infty\}| = O(\epsilon N^2).$$

Let us now consider v finite. Then X_v consists of a union of sets of the form $\{(x,y) \in \mathbb{Q}_v \times \mathbb{Q}_v : x/y \in B_p\}$, where B_p is a ball in $\mathbb{Q}_p$ of area $\leq \epsilon$. Now, if the ball B_p has area $1/p^k$, the set $\{(x,y) \in \mathbb{Q}_v \times \mathbb{Q}_v : x/y \in B_p\}$ is a lattice coset $a + L$, where L has index p^k. The number of $-N \leq x, y \leq N$ in a lattice coset $a + L$ where L has index p^k is $(1/p^k + o(1))(2N)^2$. Hence

$$|\{-N \leq x, y \leq N : (x,y) \in X_v\}| = O(\epsilon N^2).$$

Thus, the total contribution of all sets X_v to (7.31) is $O(\epsilon)$ (where the constant depends on S, $\mathscr{S}'$ and L).

Much as in Prop. 7.11, we define $R_v = \mathbb{Q}_v \setminus X_v$,

$$\rho(x,y) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \iota_v(x,y) \in R_v \text{ for every } v \in \mathscr{S}', \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We have shown that

$$\mathrm{av}_{S\cap(a+L),\text{coprime}} \prod_{v\in\mathscr{S}'} g_v(x,y)\alpha(x,y) = \mathrm{av}_{S\cap(a+L),\text{coprime}}\, \rho(x,y) \prod_{v\in\mathscr{S}'} g_v(x,y)\alpha(x,y) + O(\epsilon).$$

For each $v \in \mathscr{S}'$, the function g_v is locally constant on R_v. The set $R_\infty \in \mathbb{R}^2$ is the union of the closure of finitely many disjoint sectors $\{U_{\infty,j}\}$; since sectors are connected, g_∞ is constant on each sector. For each $p \in \mathscr{S}'$, the set R_p is compact; thus, it can be covered by finitely many p-adic balls $U_{p,j}$ in $\mathbb{Q}_p \cap \mathbb{Q}_p$ on each of which g_p is constant. We must now show that, for every choice of indices $\vec{j}$, the average of

$$\prod_{v\in\mathscr{S}'} g_v(x,y)\cdot\alpha(x,y)$$

on each set of the form

$$\{(x,y) \in S \cap S_j \cap (a+L) \cap (a_j + L_{\vec{j}}) \cap [-N,N]^2 : \gcd(x,y) = 1\} \tag{7.32}$$

is 0. (Here S_j is a sector $S_j = U_{\infty,j}$ as above, whereas $L_{\vec{j}}$ is the intersection of preimages $\iota_p^{-1}(U_{p,j_p})$ of p-adic balls U_{p,j_p} as above (one per prime $p \in \mathscr{S}'$) under the injection $\iota_p : \mathbb{Z}\times\mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Q}_p \times \mathbb{Q}_p$; since every preimage $\iota_p^{-1}(U_{p,j_p})$ is a lattice coset, the intersection $L_{\vec{j}} = \cap_{p\in\mathscr{S}'} \iota_p^{-1}(U_{p,j_p})$ is itself a lattice coset.) The product $\prod_{v\in\mathscr{S}'} g_v(x,y)$ is constant on each set (7.32), and condition (7.29) assures us that $\alpha(x,y)$ averages to 0 on every set of the form (7.32). Hence we are done. □

We should now prove that we can remove the word "coprime" from (7.29). Let us first prove an easy preparatory lemma.

Lemma 7.13. *Let $a+L \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$ be a lattice coset. Assume that $\{(x,y) \in a+L : \gcd(x,y) = 1\}$ is non-empty. Then, for any sector S,*

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{(2N)^2} |\{(x,y) \in S \cap (a+L) \cap [-N,N]^2 : \gcd(x,y) = 1\}| \tag{7.33}$$

exists and is non-zero.

By the definition of sectors (3.6), all sectors are non-empty.

Proof. We will prove something stronger and more explicit:

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{(2N)^2} |\{(x,y) \in S \cap (a+L) \cap [-N,N]^2 : \gcd(x,y) = 1\}| \\ &\qquad = \frac{c_\infty}{[\mathbb{Z}^2 : L]} \prod_{p | [\mathbb{Z}^2:L]|} (1 - c_p) \prod_{p \nmid [\mathbb{Z}^2:L]|} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^2}\right), \end{aligned} \tag{7.34}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} c_\infty &= \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{|S \cap [-N,N||}{(2N)^2}, \\ c_p &= \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } (a+L) \cap p\mathbb{Z}^2 = \emptyset \\ \frac{[\mathbb{Z}^2:L]}{[\mathbb{Z}^2:L_p]} & \text{if } (a+L)\cap p\mathbb{Z}^2 \text{ is a coset of a lattice } L_p \subset \mathbb{Z}^2. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \tag{7.35}$$

Now that we know that we have to prove this, the rest is very easy.

Let M be a large integer. Then the right side of (7.34) is

$$\frac{c_\infty}{[\mathbb{Z}^2 : L]} \prod_{\substack{p \| [\mathbb{Z}^2:L]| \\ p \leq M}} c_p \prod_{\substack{p \nmid |[\mathbb{Z}^2:L]| \\ p \leq M}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^2}\right) + O\left(\frac{1}{M}\right),$$

whereas

$$|\{-N \leq x, y \leq N : \exists p > M \text{ such that } p | \gcd(x,y)\}| = O\left(\frac{1}{M} + \frac{1}{N}\right) \cdot N^2.$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned} |\{(x,y) \in & S \cap (a+L) \cap [-N,N]^2 : \gcd(x,y) = 1\}| \\ &= |\{(x,y) \in S \cap (a+L) \cap [-N,N]^2 : (p \nmid x \ \vee \ p \nmid y) \ \forall p \leq M\}| \\ &+ O\left(\frac{1}{M} + \frac{1}{N}\right) \cdot N^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, it will be enough to show that

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{1}{(2N)^2} |\{(x,y) \in S \cap (a+L) \cap [-N,N]^2 : (p \nmid x \ \vee \ p \nmid y) \ \forall p \leq M\}| \tag{7.36}$$

equals

$$\frac{c_\infty}{[\mathbb{Z}^2 : L]} \cdot \prod_{\substack{p \| [\mathbb{Z}^2:L]| \\ p \leq M}} (1 - c_p) \prod_{\substack{p \nmid |[\mathbb{Z}^2:L]| \\ p \leq M}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^2}\right).$$

Let

$$c_m = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } (a+L) \cap m\mathbb{Z}^2 = \emptyset \\ \frac{[\mathbb{Z}^2:L]}{[\mathbb{Z}^2:L_m]} & \text{if } (a+L) \cap m\mathbb{Z}^2 \text{ is a coset of a lattice } L_m \subset \mathbb{Z}^2. \end{cases}$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned} |\{(x,y) \in & S \cap (a+L) \cap [-N,N]^2 : (p \nmid x \ \vee \ p \nmid y) \ \forall p \leq M\}| \\ &= \sum_{\substack{m \\ p|m \Rightarrow p \leq M}} \mu(m) \cdot \{(x,y) \in S \cap (a+L) \cap [-N,N]^2 : m|x \ \wedge m|y\} \\ &= \sum_{\substack{m \\ p|m \Rightarrow p \leq M}} \mu(m) \cdot \frac{c_\infty}{[\mathbb{Z}^2 : L]} \cdot (2N)^2 c_m, \end{aligned} \tag{7.37}$$

where we are using (7.10). For m square-free,

$$c_m = \prod_{p|m} c_p.$$

Hence (7.36) equals

$$\frac{c_\infty}{[\mathbb{Z}^2 : L]} \cdot \prod_{p \leq M} (1 - c_p).$$

Now, given two lattice cosets $a + L$, $a + L'$ with coprime indices $[\mathbb{Z}^2 : L]$, $[\mathbb{Z}^2 : L']$, their intersection is a lattice coset of index $[\mathbb{Z}^2 : L] \cdot [\mathbb{Z}^2 : L']$. Hence (by (7.35))

$$c_p = \frac{1}{p^2}$$

for $p \nmid |[\mathbb{Z}^2 : L]|$, and so we are done. □

Remark. We do not particularly care about the rate of convergence in (7.33); otherwise we would have proven Lemma 7.13 differently. For a discussion on how to do things efficiently (from the point of view of rates of convergence), see appendix A. (Actually, proving Lemma 7.13 efficiently is fairly easy; taking care of other similar issues elsewhere in the paper is a harder problem. See also [18, §3], where this sort of issue is dealt with at length.)

Lemma 7.14. *Let $f : \mathbb{Z}^2 \to \mathbb{C}$ be a bounded function. Let $S \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a sector. Suppose that*

$$\operatorname{av}_{S\cap(a+L)} f = 0 \tag{7.38}$$

for every lattice coset $a + L$. Then

$$\operatorname{av}_{S\cap(a+L),coprime} f = 0 \tag{7.39}$$

for every lattice coset $a + L$ such that $\{(x, y) \in a + L : \gcd(x, y) = 1\}$ is non-empty.

Sketch of proof. By Lemma 7.13, the denominator implicit in the average in (7.39) is $\gg N^2$. Hence, it is enough to show that

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{N^2}|\{(x, y) \in S \cap (a + L) \cap [-N, N]^2 : \gcd(x, y) = 1\}| = 0.$$

Using (7.38), we can prove this just like we proved Lemma 7.13: first we fix a large integer M (which we will let go to ∞ at the end), then we show (exactly as before) that the difference between

$$|\{(x, y) \in S \cap (a + L) \cap [-N, N]^2 : \gcd(x, y) = 1\}|$$

and

$$|\{(x, y) \in S \cap (a + L) \cap [-N, N]^2 : (p \nmid x \ \vee\ p \nmid y)\ \forall p \le M\}|\}| \tag{7.40}$$

is $O(1/M)$, then we express (7.40) as a sum of the form $\sum_m \mu(m)\dots$ as in (7.37) – and, lastly, we use (7.38) instead of (7.10). ☐

7.6. Families with multiplicative reduction.

It remains to prove the main theorems. Recall that, given a function $f : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{C}$, "$f$ has strong zero average over the integers" means that

$$\operatorname{av}_{a+m\mathbb{Z}} f(n) = 0$$

for every arithmetic progression $f(n)$. For $f : \mathbb{Q} \to \mathbb{C}$, "$f$ has strong zero average over the rationals" means that

$$\operatorname{av}_{\mathbb{Q},S\cap(a+L)} g = 0$$

for every sector $S \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ and every lattice coset $a + L \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$. Lastly, for $f : \mathbb{Z}^2 \to \mathbb{C}$, "$f$ has strong zero average over $\mathbb{Z}^2$" means that

$$\operatorname{av}_{S\cap(a+L)} g = 0$$

for every sector $S \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ and every lattice coset $a + L \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$. See also (7.28).

Recall as well that, when we write **Theorem 0.0** ($\mathfrak{X}(P)$, $\mathfrak{Y}(Q)$), we mean a theorem conditional on hypotheses $\mathfrak{X}$ and $\mathfrak{Y}$ in so far as they concern the objects P and Q, respectively. The polynomials $B_{\mathscr{E}}$ and $M_{\mathscr{E}}$ were defined in (2.1); they are the polynomials describing the places at which a curve $\mathscr{E}$ over $\mathbb{Q}(T)$ has quite bad or multiplicative reduction, respectively.

Main Theorem 1 ($\mathscr{A}_1(B_{\mathscr{E}}(t, 1))$, $\mathscr{B}_1(M_{\mathscr{E}}(t, 1))$). *Let $\mathscr{E}$ be a family of elliptic curves over $\mathbb{Q}$. Assume that $M_{\mathscr{E}}(t, 1)$ is not constant. Then $t \mapsto W(\mathscr{E}(t))$ has strong zero average over the integers.*

Proof. Immediate from Theorem 6.6 and Prop. 7.11 with $\alpha(x) = \lambda(M_{\mathscr{E}}(x,1))$. Condition (7.24) is furnished by hypothesis $\mathscr{B}_1(M_{\mathscr{E}}(x,1))$. ☐

Main Theorem 2 ($\mathscr{A}_2(B_{\mathscr{E}})$, $\mathscr{B}_2(M_{\mathscr{E}})$)**.** *Let $\mathscr{E}$ be a family of elliptic curves over $\mathbb{Q}$. Assume that $M_{\mathscr{E}}$ is not constant*[5]*. Then $t \mapsto W(\mathscr{E}(t))$ has strong zero average over the rationals.*

Proof. Immediate from Theorem 6.6 and Prop. 7.12 with $\alpha(x,y) = \lambda(M_{\mathscr{E}}(x,y))$. (Use Lemma 7.14 to prove condition (7.29) using hypothesis $\mathscr{B}_2(M_{\mathscr{E}})$.) ☐

One can go in the other direction: if the average root number of a family is zero, then we can prove hypothesis $\mathscr{B}_j$ for the associated polynomial $M_{\mathscr{E}}$.

Proposition 7.15 ($\mathscr{A}_1(B_{\mathscr{E}}(t,1))$)**.** *Let $\mathscr{E}$ be a family of elliptic curves over $\mathbb{Q}$. Assume that $M_{\mathscr{E}}(t,1)$ is not constant.*

Suppose that $t \mapsto W(\mathscr{E}(t))$ has strong zero average over the integers. Then hypothesis $\mathscr{B}_1(M_{\mathscr{E}}(x,1))$ holds, i.e., $\lambda(M_{\mathscr{E}}(x,1))$ has strong zero average over the integers.

Proof. Equation (6.19) in Theorem 6.6 states that

$$W(\mathscr{E}(x/y)) = g(x,y) \cdot h(x,y) \cdot \lambda(M_{\mathscr{E}}(x,y)). \tag{7.41}$$

Since the left side is never zero, the expressions on the right side are non-zero for all but finitely many rationals x/y. (Equation (6.19) is valid for all but finitely many rationals.) This implies that

$$\lambda(M_{\mathscr{E}}(x,y)) = (g(x,y))^{-1} \cdot (h(x,y))^{-1} \cdot W(\mathscr{E}(x/y)). \tag{7.42}$$

Now apply Prop. 7.11 with $\alpha(x) = W(\mathscr{E}(x))$. ☐

Proposition 7.16 ($\mathscr{A}_2(B_{\mathscr{E}})$)**.** *Let $\mathscr{E}$ be a family of elliptic curves over $\mathbb{Q}$. Assume that $M_{\mathscr{E}}$ is not constant. Then $\mathscr{B}_2(M_{\mathscr{E}}(x,y))$ holds, i.e., $\lambda(M_{\mathscr{E}}(x,y))$ has strong zero average over $\mathbb{Z}^2$.*

Proof. Again, (7.41) implies (7.42). Now apply

$$\lambda(M_{\mathscr{E}}(x,y)) = (g(x,y))^{-1} \cdot (h(x,y))^{-1} \cdot W(\mathscr{E}(x/y)).$$

Now apply Prop. 7.12 with $\alpha(x,y) = W(\mathscr{E}(x,y))$. We obtain that

$$\mathrm{av}_{S\cap L,\mathrm{coprime}}\, \lambda(M_{\mathscr{E}}(x,y)) = 0. \tag{7.43}$$

Since λ is completely multiplicative and $M_{\mathscr{E}}$ is homogeneous,

$$\lambda(M_{\mathscr{E}}(mx,my)) = \lambda(m^d)\lambda(M_{\mathscr{E}}(x,y))$$

for all m, x, y, where $d = \deg(M_{\mathscr{E}})$. Summing over all $m \leq M$, M large, we deduce from (7.43) that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{(x,y)\in S\cap L\cap[-N,N]^2 \\ \gcd(x,y)\leq M}} \lambda(M_{\mathscr{E}}(x,y)) &= \sum_{1\leq m\leq M} \mu(m)\lambda(m^d) \cdot o(N^2/m^2) \\ &= o(N^2). \end{aligned}$$

The number of pairs $(x,y) \in S\cap L\cap[-N,N]^2$ such that $\gcd(x,y) > M$ is $O(N^2/M)+O(N)$. We let $N \to \infty$ and obtain

$$\mathrm{av}_{S\cap L}\, \lambda(M_{\mathscr{E}}(x,y)) = O(1/M) + o(1).$$

Since M can be set to be arbitrarily large, we are done. ☐

---

[5] In other words, assume that $\mathscr{E}$ has at least one point of multiplicative reduction over $\mathbb{Q}(T)$.

In general, hypothesis $\mathscr{B}_2$ is very difficult to prove. The state of knowledge on the subject was static for over a century. It was then proven for polynomials of degree 3 by the author ([20], [19]; the latter paper builds on work by Friedlander and Iwaniec [11] as well as Heath-Brown [16]). Hypothesis $\mathscr{B}_2$ has recently been proven for products of four linear factors by Green and Tao [14] (using methods related to their proof of the existence of arbitrarily long progressions in the primes). It is possible that Green and Tao (or their associates) shall soon prove $\mathscr{B}_2$ for products of more than four linear polynomials in $\mathbb{Z}[x, y]$. Further progress in the near future seems unlikely.

Hypothesis $\mathscr{B}_1$ is even harder. It has been known for degree 1 for more than a hundred years, but it is extremely improbable that it will proven for any (square-free) polynomials of degree ≥ 2 in the near future: such a task would be of the same difficulty as proving the twin prime number conjecture.

To summarise: (a) the main theorems assert the truth of general results on root numbers under the assumption of standard conjectures in analytic number theory (hypotheses $\mathscr{A}_j$, $\mathscr{B}_j$); (b) thus, these general results are unconditionally true in the cases in which these conjectures are known to be true; (c) if the results on numbers were proven unconditionally for some more cases, then one of the harder conjectures ($\mathscr{B}_1$ or $\mathscr{B}_2$) would follow in a case in which it is not yet known. (In (c), one of the easier conjectures ($\mathscr{A}_j$) is assumed; recall that the easier conjectures are known for all polynomials of degree ≤ 3 (if $j = 1$) or degree ≤ 6 (if $j = 2$).)

It thus seems that the main theorems close the matter of averages of root numbers on one-parameter families for the while being.

7.7. **Some unconditional examples.** It is a simple matter to construct a family $\mathscr{E}$ with $M_{\mathscr{E}}$ equal to a given square-free homogeneous polynomial in $\mathscr{O}_{K,V}[x, y]$, up to multiplication by a scalar. For example, if we want $M_{\mathscr{E}} = x^3 + 2y^3$, we may choose

$$c_4 = 1 - 1728(t^3 + 2), \quad c_6 = (1 - 1728(t^3 + 2))^2.$$

We then have

$$\Delta = \frac{c_4^3 - c_6^2}{1728} = (t^3 + 2) \cdot (1 - 1728(t^3 + 2))^3,$$

and so the only place of multiplicative reduction over $\mathbb{Q}(T)$ is the one corresponding to $t^3 + 2 \in \mathbb{Q}[T]$. In other words, $M_{\mathscr{E}} = x^3 + 2y^3$.

In general, we can construct an elliptic curve $\mathscr{E}$ over $K(T)$ with given factors in the denominator of j. The factors in the denominator of j correspond to the places of $K(T)$ where the reduction is either additive and potentially multiplicative or multiplicative. We can then apply quadratic twists to make places of additive, potentially multiplicative reduction into places of multiplicative reduction, and vice versa, until we have multiplicative reduction exactly at the places we wish to have it, and at no other place. It is thus that we can find families $\mathscr{E}$ with any given (square-free, homogeneous) $M_{\mathscr{E}}$.

Families $\mathscr{E}$ with $M_{\mathscr{E}}$ given and c_4, c_6 coprime are slightly harder to find. Here are some examples:

$$\begin{array}{lll}
c_4 = 2 + 4t + t^2, & c_6 = 1 + 9t + 6t^2 + t^3, & M_{\mathscr{E}} = (2x + 7y)(x^2 + 4xy + y^2), \\
c_4 = 2 - 4t + t^2, & c_6 = 3 + 9t - 6t^2 + t^3, & M_{\mathscr{E}} = 10x^3 - 63x^2y + 102xy^2 + y^3, \\
c_4 = 4, & c_6 = 11 + t, & M_{\mathscr{E}} = y(x + 3y)(x + 19y), \\
c_4 = 3, & c_6 = 2 + 7t, & M_{\mathscr{E}} = y(49x^2 + 28xy - 23y^2), \\
c_4 = 1 + t, & c_6 = -1 + 3t, & M_{\mathscr{E}} = xy(x - 3y).
\end{array} \tag{7.44}$$

Since $\deg(M_{\mathscr{E}}) \leq 3$ and $\deg(B_{\mathscr{E}}) \leq 6$ in all of these cases, Main Theorem 2 is unconditional for all of these families.

Appendix A. Rates of convergence

We have computed averages over $\mathbb{Z}$ and $\mathbb{Q}$, but we have not determined their rates of convergence. How do we show that – for families $\mathscr{E}$ for which we can determine the average $\mathrm{av}_{\mathbb{Z}} W(\mathscr{E}(t)$ and $\mathrm{av}_{\mathbb{Q}} W(\mathscr{E}(t)$ unconditionally – the expressions

$$\frac{1}{N}\sum_{1\leq n\leq N} W(\mathscr{E}(n)) = \mathrm{av}_{\mathbb{Z}} W(\mathscr{E}(t)) + o(1),$$

$$\frac{\sum_{(x,y)\in[-N,N]^2:\gcd(x,y)=1} W(\mathscr{E}(x/y))}{|\{(x,y)\in[-N,N]^2 : \gcd(x,y)=1\}|} = \mathrm{av}_{\mathbb{Q}} W(\mathscr{E}(t)) + o(1)$$

have small error terms $o(1)$?

There are limitations imposed by the inputs: there are error terms implicit in hypotheses $\mathscr{A}_1$, $\mathscr{A}_2$, $\mathscr{B}_1$ and $\mathscr{B}_2$, and the cases of the hypotheses that are known are not always known with the best error terms they might have. For example, when I showed [20, Thm. 3.3] that $\mathrm{av}_{\mathbb{Z}^2}\lambda(xy(x+y)) = 0$, I showed, in fact, that

$$\text{(A.1)} \qquad \frac{1}{|[-N,N]|}\sum_{-N\leq x,y\leq N}\lambda(xy(x+y)) = O\left(\frac{\log\log N}{\log N}\right),$$

where the implied constant is absolute. It is quite probable that (A.1) is still true if $O\left(\frac{\log\log N}{\log N}\right)$ is replaced by $O(N^{-\beta})$, $\beta > 0$ small, but we are far from proving that.

Putting the issue of the inputs to one side, we can see – if we go through the proofs in the present paper keeping track of the error terms - that there is one clearly non-trivial issue. The issue is the passage to the limit at the beginning of the proofs of Propositions 7.7 and 7.11 (and their two-dimensional analogues, Propositions 7.8 and 7.12).

This issue is not particular to the study of root numbers. It arises, for example, in the classical problem of determining the number of integers $n \leq N$ such that $f(n)$ is square-free (or free of factors that are kth powers, in general), where f is a polynomial. Say we know that

$$\text{(A.2)} \qquad |\{n\leq N : p^2|f(n) \text{ for some } p > n^{0.1}\}| = O(N^{1-\beta}),$$

where $\beta > 0$. We would like to conclude that

$$\text{(A.3)} \qquad |\{n\leq N : f(n) \text{ is square-free}\}| = c_f\cdot N + O(N^{1-\beta}) + O(N^{1-\beta'}),$$

say, where c_f is a constant and $\beta' > 0$. It turns out that one can in fact conclude this (with $\beta' = 1/3-\epsilon$, $\epsilon > 0$ arbitrarily small), but this is not very easy. If one were to do things in the obvious way, one would end up having an error term of $O(N/(\log N))$ instead of $O(N^{1-\beta'})$.

The implication (A.2) ⇒ (A.3) was proven in [18, Prop. 3.4]. The issue is solved in full generality in [18, §3.2–3.4]. In particular, [18, Prop. 3.8 and 3.9] are explicit analogues of Propositions 7.7 and 7.8 in the present paper; they give explicit (and rather good) error terms. The main idea (namely, the optimised alternative to the passage to the limit at the beginning of the proof of Prop. 7.7) is contained in a rather cryptic-looking general result [18, Prop. 3.2]. (The setup and proof of [18, Prop. 3.2] were called a *riddle*; the term was meant to suggest a coarse sieve.)

In general, [18, §3] contains a great deal of what we did with much less work in §7.1, §7.3 and §7.5. The main difference is that, in [18, §3], a great deal of effort was put into making all error terms explicit and good. (An unintended but predictable effect was the fact that [18, §3] is a little hard to read.) If the results in §7.1, §7.3 and §7.5 are replaced by those in [18, §3], one obtains analogues of Propositions 7.9 and 7.10 and of the main theorems with explicit error terms. As the inputs – namely, hypotheses $\mathscr{A}_j$ and $\mathscr{B}_j$ –

do not always give good error terms themselves, the gains over what one would get by proceeding naively are not always large.

Appendix B. A non-constant family with non-zero average root number over $\mathbb{Q}$

A *non-constant* family $\mathscr{E}$ is one where the fibres $\mathscr{E}(t)$ are not all isomorphic to each other over $\mathbb{C}$. Families of quadratic twists, for example, are not non-constant. There are known examples of (a) families of quadratic twists $\mathscr{E}$ with $\operatorname{av}_{\mathbb{Q}} W(\mathscr{E}(t)) \neq 0$ ([28]) and (b) non-constant families $\mathscr{E}$ with $\operatorname{av}_{\mathbb{Z}} W(\mathscr{E}(t)) = 0$ ([29]). In this appendix, we will see an example of a non-constant family $\mathscr{E}$ with $\operatorname{av}_{\mathbb{Q}} W(\mathscr{E}(t)) \neq 0$.

We recall that one of our main results in the present paper was that $\operatorname{av}_{\mathbb{Q}} W(\mathscr{E}(t)) = 0$ for all families $\mathscr{E}$ with places of multiplicative reduction, conditionally on two standard conjectures in analytic number theory. We also gave an expression (Prop. 7.10 (7.22)) for $\operatorname{av}_{\mathbb{Q}} W(\mathscr{E}(t))$ when $\mathscr{E}$ has no places of multiplicative reduction. In the light of (7.22), it is unsurprising that there are non-constant families $\mathscr{E}$ with no places of multiplicative reduction and $\operatorname{av}_{\mathbb{Q}} W(\mathscr{E}(t)) \neq 0$. What follows serves as a completely explicit rendering of most of the arguments of the present paper – or, at least, of those in §6; we will also need the results in §7.

The arguments in §4 will not appear here, as we engaged in them precisely in order to avoid explicit case-work. Since the family we will treat has no multiplicative reduction, the steps corresponding to §5 will be exceedingly simple, though the key element (namely, quadratic reciprocity) will still be present (vd. equation (B.20)).

It will be satisfying to see the infinite product of integrals in (7.22) take a very concrete form, namely, equation (B.33). In general, we have shown that the p-adic integrals in (7.22) are rational, and that the double integral in (7.22) is algebraic; this is part of the statement of Prop. 7.10. The same method that we used to prove this can be used to provide an algorithm (long and tedious) to give (complicated) explicit expressions in terms of the definition of $\mathscr{E}$ for all of the integrals in (7.22).

The example we are about to see is actually fairly representative, though it is a little simpler than most other curves without multiplicative reduction would be. (This is why this example was chosen.) In our example, the expressions we will get for the integrals $\prod_{p\notin S} \int_{O_p} h_p(x,y)\,dxdy$ depend only on the number of solutions in $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ to $19 + 11t^2 + 19t^4 \equiv 0 \bmod p$ – the integrals do not depend on p otherwise; an exception is made for $p = 2, 3, 7, 19$, which will have to be treated separately. In general, for a family $\mathscr{E}$ without multiplicative reduction, the integrals $\prod_{p\notin S} \int_{O_p} h_p(x,y)\,dxdy$ (for p outside a finite set of primes that have to be treated separately) depend only on the number of solutions in $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ to each of the equations $f_i(x) \equiv 0 \bmod p$, where $f_1, f_2, \dots, f_k \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ are fixed polynomials depending only on the definition of $\mathscr{E}$.

B.1. **The family $\mathscr{E}$. Preparatory work.** Let us, then, construct a non-constant family $\mathscr{E}/\mathbb{Q}[T]$ such that $W(\mathscr{E}(t))$ does not average to 0 over the rationals. Set $f_1 = -5 - 2T^2$, $f_2 = 2 + 5T^2$. Let $\mathscr{E}$ be the elliptic curve over $\mathbb{Q}(T)$ given by the parameters

$$c_4 = f_1 f_2 (f_1^3 - f_2^3)^2, \quad c_6 = \frac{1}{2}(f_1^3 + f_2^3)(f_1^3 - f_2^3)^3,$$
$$\Delta = \frac{c_4^3 - c_6^2}{1728} = -2^{-8}3^{-3}(f_1^3 - f_2^3)^8.$$

Here note that

$$\begin{aligned} f_1^3(t) - f_2^3(t) &= (f_1^2(t) + f_1(t)f_2(t) + f_2^2(t))(f_1(t) - f_2(t)) \\ &= -7(19 + 11t^2 + 19t^4)(1 + t^2). \end{aligned} \tag{B.1}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} f_1^3(t)+f_2^3(t) &= (f_1^2(t)-f_1(t)f_2(t)+f_2^2(t))(f_1(t)+f_2(t)) \\ &= 3^2(13t^4+23t^2+13)(t-1)(t+1). \end{aligned} \tag{B.2}$$

Let us determine the sets and polynomials that were defined in §6.2.3. The set of interesting places $\mathscr{P}$ consists of all places w of $K(T)$ such that $w(c_4)\neq 0$, $w(c_6)\neq 0$ or $w(\Delta)\neq 0$. In our example,

$$\mathscr{P}=\{w_{f_1},w_{f_2},w_{t-1},w_{t+1},w_{t^2+1},w_{19t^4+11t^2+19},w_{13t^4+23t^2+13},\deg(\mathrm{den})-\deg(\mathrm{num})\},$$

where we denote by w_f the place of $K(T)$ associated to an irreducible polynomial in $K[T]$. The homogeneous polynomials in $\mathbb{Z}[x,y]$ associated to these places (2.1.1) are

$$\begin{gathered} P_1=(-2(x/y)^2-5)\cdot y^2=-2x^2-5y^2, \\ P_2=5x^2+2y^2,\quad P_3=x-y,\quad P_4=x+y,\quad P_5=x^2+y^2, \\ P_6=19x^4+11x^2y^2+19y^4,\quad P_7=13x^4+23x^2y^2+13y^4,\quad P_8\ =y. \end{gathered} \tag{B.3}$$

The resultants $\mathrm{Res}(P_i,P_j)$, $1\leq i<j\leq 8$, have the following prime factors:

$$2,\ 3,\ 5,\ 7,\ 13,\ 19. \tag{B.4}$$

(For example, $\mathrm{Res}(P_6,P_7)=2^4\cdot 3^4\cdot 7^8$ and $\mathrm{Res}(P_1,P_8)=-5$.) If we consider only P_i, P_j with $1\leq i<j\leq 7$ (that is, if we leave out the possibility $P_j=P_8$), the resultants $\mathrm{Res}(P_i,P_j)$ have only the following prime factors:

$$2,\ 3,\ 7. \tag{B.5}$$

We write

$$\begin{aligned} c_4(x/y) &= P_1(x,y)P_2(x,y)(P_5(x,y)\cdot P_6(x,y))^3P_8(x,y)^{-16}, \\ c_6(x/y) &= \frac{1}{2}(P_3(x,y)P_4(x,y)P_7(x,y))\cdot(P_5(x,y)P_6(x,y))^3P_8(x,y)^{-24}, \\ \Delta(x/y) &= -2^{-8}3^{-3}(P_5(x,y)P_6(x,y))^8P_8(x,y)^{-48}. \end{aligned} \tag{B.6}$$

Thus, the prime factors of the ideal defined in (6.6) are 2, 3, 5, 7, 13, 19.

It is also worthwhile to note that the prime factors of the discriminant of every polynomial P_j, $1\leq j\leq 8$, are all contained in the set $\{2,3,7,19\}$.

We will look at the local root number of $W(\mathscr{E}(t))$ at the places $p=2,3,5,7,13,19$, and then at all other places.

B.2. **Local root numbers.**

B.2.1. *The root number at $p=2$.* Suppose first that $v_2(t)>0$. Then $v_2(f_1(t))=0$, $v_2(f_2(t))=1$, $v_2(f_1^3(t)-f_2^3(t))=0$, $v_2(f_1^3(t)+f_2^3(t))=0$. Hence $v_2(c_4(t))=1$, $v_2(c_6(t))=-1$, $v_2(\Delta(t))=-8$. Since $v_2(c_6(t))=-1<0$ and $v_2(\Delta)=-8<0$, this cannot be an integral model. We set $c_4'=2^4c_4$, $c_6'=2^6c_6$, $\Delta'=2^{12}\Delta$. This model has

$$v_2(c_4')=5,\qquad v_2(c_6')=5,\qquad v_2(\Delta')=4.$$

This new model can be written as $y^2=x^3-27c_4-54c_6$; since all of the coefficients of this equation are in $\mathbb{Z}_3$, the new model is integral. (A model is integral if it can be written down in (short or long) Weierstrass form with integral coefficients.) Since the model given by c_4, c_6, Δ was not integral, the new model is a minimal integral model.

Before we use [15, Table 1], we must determine $2^{-v_2(c_6)}c_6=2c_6 \bmod 8$. Now $f_1(t)\equiv -5\equiv 3 \bmod 8$ and $v(f_2(t))>0$. Hence $f_1^3(t)-f_2^3(t)\equiv 3 \bmod 8$ and $f_1^3(t)+f_2^3(t)\equiv 3 \bmod 8$. Thus $2c_6\equiv 1 \bmod 8$. The second line marked III in [15, Table 1] now gives us $W_2(\mathscr{E}(t))=-1$.

Suppose now that $v_2(t) = 0$. Then $v_2(f_1(t)) = 0$ (and $f_1(t) \equiv 1 \bmod 8$), $v_2(f_2(t)) = 0$ (and $f_2(t) \equiv -1 \bmod 8$), $v_2(f_1^3(t) - f_2^3(t)) = 1$, $v_2(f_1^3(t) + f_2^3(t)) \geq 3$. Hence $v_2(c_4(t)) = 2$, $v_2(c_6(t)) \geq 5$, $v_2(\Delta(t)) = 0$. Suppose that this model were integral. By the transformations in [36, §3.1] (or any other standard text), $c_4(t) = b_2^2 - 24b_4$ and $b_2 = a_1^2 + 4a_2$, where a_1, a_2 and b_4 are parameters that are integers if the model is integral. Since $v_2(c_4(t)) = 2$ and $8|24$, we obtain $v_2(b_2) = 1$, but, in view of $b_2 = a_1^2 + 4a_2$, this is impossible. The model cannot be integral. Let us pass to $c_4' = 2^4 c_4(t)$, $c_6' = 2^6 c_6(t)$, $\Delta' = 2^{12}\Delta(t)$, which is certainly integral (because it can be written as $y^2 = x^3 - 27c_4(t) - 54c_6(t)$) and thus minimal integral. The new model satisfies

$$v_2(c_4') = 6, \qquad v_2(c_6') \geq 11, \qquad v_2(\Delta') = 12.$$

Since $c_4 = f_1 f_2 (f_1^3 - f_2^3)^2$, we have

$$\frac{1}{2^6} c_4' = \frac{1}{4} c_4(t) \equiv 1 \cdot (-1) \cdot \left(\frac{1^3 - (-1)^3}{2}\right)^2 \equiv 3 \bmod 4.$$

Now the second line marked I_2^* in [15, Table 1] gives us $W_2(\mathscr{E}(t)) = -1$.

Lastly, let us consider the case $v_2(t) < 0$. Let $k = -v_2(t)$. Then $v_3(f_1(t)) = -2k+1$, $v_3(f_2(t)) = -2k$, $v_3(f_1^3(t) - f_2^3(t)) = -6k$ and $v_3(f_1^3(t) + f_2^3(t)) = -6k$. Hence

$$v_2(c_4(t)) = -16k + 1, \qquad v_2(c_6(t)) = -24k - 1, \qquad v_2(\Delta(t)) = -48k - 8.$$

We set $c_4' = (2^{4k+1})^4 c_4(t)$, $c_6' = (2^{4k+1})^6 c_6(t)$, $\Delta' = (2^{4k+1})^{12}\Delta(t)$, and obtain that

$$v_2(c_4') = 5, \qquad v_2(c_6') = 5, \qquad v_2(\Delta') = 4. \tag{B.7}$$

This new model is given by the equation $y^2 = x^3 - 27\frac{c_4'}{2^4} - 54\frac{c_6'}{2^6}$, which, by (B.7), has all of its coefficients in $\mathbb{Z}_2$. Hence the new model is (minimal) integral.

A brief calculation gives $2^{-5}c_6' = 2^{24k+1}c_6(t) \equiv -1 \bmod 4$. Now the second line from the top in [15, Table 1] gives us $W_2(\mathscr{E}(t)) = 1$.

We conclude that, for $t \in \mathbb{Q}_2$,

$$W_2(\mathscr{E}(t)) = \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if } v_2(t) \geq 0, \\ 1 & \text{if } v_2(t) < 0. \end{cases} \tag{B.8}$$

B.2.2. *The root number at* $p = 3$. Let $t \in \mathbb{Q}_3$. Suppose first that $v_3(t) > 0$. Then $v_3(f_1(t)) = 0$, $v_3(f_2(t)) = 0$, and – since $f_1(t) \equiv 1 \bmod 3$ and $f_2(t) \equiv 2 \bmod 3$ – $v_3(f_1(t)^3 - f_2(t)^3) = 0$. On the other hand, because $(-5)^3 + 2^3 \equiv 0 \bmod 9$, we have $v_3(f_1(t)^3 + f_2(t)^3) \geq 2$. Therefore

$$v_3(c_4(t)) = 0, \qquad v_3(c_6(t)) \geq 2, \qquad v_3(\Delta(t)) = -3.$$

Since $v_3(\Delta) < 0$, we see that this model is not integral at 3. If we set $c_4' = 3^4 c_4(t)$, $c_6' = 3^6 c_6(t)$, $\Delta' = 3^{12}\Delta(t)$, we obtain a new model for the same curve. This model has

$$v_3(c_4') = 4, \qquad v_3(c_6') \geq 8, \qquad v_3(\Delta') = 9. \tag{B.9}$$

This new model can be written as $y^2 = x^3 - 27c_4(t) - 54c_6(t)$; since all of the coefficients of this equation are in $\mathbb{Z}_3$, the new model is integral, and, in particular, minimal integral.

By [15, Table 2][6], an elliptic curve E with a minimal integral model given by parameters c_4', c_6', Δ' satisfying (B.9) has local root number $W_3(E) = 1$. Hence $W_3(\mathscr{E}(t)) = 1$ for all $t \in \mathbb{Q}_3$ with $v_3(t) > 0$ (and, in particular, for all $t \in \mathbb{Q}$ with $v_3(t) > 0$).

Suppose now that $v_3(t) = 0$. Then $t^2 \equiv 1 \mod 3$. Hence $v_3(f_1(t)) = 0$, $v_3(f_2(t)) = 0$, and – since $f_1(t) \equiv 2 \bmod 3$ and $f_2(t) \equiv 1 \bmod 3$ – $v_3(f_1(t)^3 - f_2(t)^3) = 0$. On the other hand, because $(-5 - 2\cdot 4)^3 + (2 + 5\cdot 4)^3 \equiv 0 \bmod 9$ and $(-5 - 2\cdot(-4))^3 + (2 + 5\cdot(-4))^3 \equiv$

---

[6] As was pointed out in [29], the special condition $c_4' \equiv 1 \bmod 4$ should be added to line 3 in table 1 of [15].

$0 \bmod 9$, we have $v_3(f_1(t)^3 + f_2(t)^3) \geq 2$. Proceeding as before, we get that $c_4' = 3^4 c_4(t)$, $c_6' = 3^6 c_6(t)$, $\Delta' = 3^{12}\Delta(t)$ give us a minimal integral model with

$$v_3(c_4') = 4, \quad v_3(c_6') \geq 8, \quad v_3(\Delta') = 9,$$

and so, by the same entry in [15, Table 2] as before, the local root number $W_3(E)$ at 3 is 1. We have shown that Hence $W_3(\mathscr{E}(t)) = 1$ for all $t \in \mathbb{Q}_3$ with $v_3(t) = 0$.

Suppose, lastly, that $v_3(t) < 0$. Let $k = -v_3(t)$. Then $v_3(f_1(t)) = -2k$, $v_3(f_2(t)) = -2k$, $v_3(f_1^3(t) - f_2^3(t)) = -6k$ (since $3^{2k} f_1(t) \equiv 1 \bmod 3$ and $3^{2k} f_2(t) \equiv 2 \bmod 3$) and $v_3(f_1^3(t) + f_2^3(t)) \geq -6k + 2$ (because $(-2)^3 + 5^3 \equiv 0 \bmod 9$). Hence

$$v_3(c_4(t)) = -16k, \quad v_3(c_6(t)) \geq -24k + 2, \quad v_3(\Delta(t)) = -48k - 3.$$

We set $c_4' = (3^{4k+1})^4 c_4(t)$, $c_6' = (3^{4k+1})^6 c_6(t)$, $\Delta' = (3^{4k+1})^{12}\Delta(t)$, and obtain that

$$v_3(c_4') = 4, \quad v_3(c_6') \geq 8, \quad v_3(\Delta') = 9.$$

The model given by c_4', c_6' and Δ' is a minimal integral model by the same argument as before. Hence, by the same entry in [15, Table 2] as before, $W_3(\mathscr{E}(t)) = 1$ for all $t \in \mathbb{Q}_3$ with $v_3(t) < 0$.

We conclude that

$$W_3(\mathscr{E}(t)) = 1 \tag{B.10}$$

for all $t \in \mathbb{Q}_3$.

* * *

The remaining cases tend to be a little easier – it is very simple to tell what the reduction type is at a prime $p \neq 2, 3$. Let us start by considering $p = 7$, since, among the cases that remain, it is the most complicated one.

B.2.3. *The root number at $p = 7$.* Suppose first that $v_7(t) > 0$. Then $v_7(f_1(t)) = 0$, $v_7(f_2(t)) = 0$, $v_7(f_1^3(t) - f_2^3(t)) = 1$, $v_7(f_1^3(t) + f_2^3(t)) = 0$. Hence

$$v_7(c_4(t)) = 2, \quad v_7(c_6(t)) = 3, \quad v_7(\Delta(t)) = 8. \tag{B.11}$$

For valuations v at places of $\mathbb{Q}$ other than 2 or 3, the inequalities $v(c_4) \geq 0$, $v(c_6) \geq 0$, $v(\Delta) \geq 0$ guarantee that the model is integral; the inequality $v(\Delta) < 12$ guarantees that, if the model is integral, it is minimal integral. Hence our model (given by $c_4(t)$, $c_6(t)$, $\Delta(t)$) is minimal integral at v_7. By (B.11), the reduction type (see §6.2.1) is additive and potentially multiplicative. We use (6.3) and obtain that

$$W_7(\mathscr{E}(t)) = (-1/7) = -1$$

for all $t \in \mathbb{Q}_7$ with $v_7(t) > 0$.

Suppose now that $v_7(t) = 0$, $t \not\equiv \pm 1 \bmod 7$. Then $v_7(f_1(t)) = 0$, $v_7(f_2(t)) = 0$, $f_1(t) \equiv f_2(t) \bmod 7$, and so $v_7(f_1^3(t) + f_2^3(t)) = 0$. By (B.1), $v_7(f_1^3(t) - f_2^3(t)) = 1 + v_7((5 + 4t^2 + 5t^4)(1 + t^2)) = 1$. We conclude that

$$v_7(c_4(t)) = 2, \quad v_7(c_6(t)) = 3, \quad v_7(\Delta(t)) = 8,$$

and so, as before,

$$W_7(\mathscr{E}(t)) = (-1/7) = -1$$

for all $t \in \mathbb{Q}_7$ with $v_7(t) = 0$, $t \not\equiv \pm 1 \bmod 7$.

Consider now the case of $v_7(t) = 0$, $t \equiv \pm 1 \bmod 7$. We get easily that $v_7(f_1(t)) \geq 1$, $v_7(f_2(t)) \geq 1$ and $v_7(f_1^3(t) + f_2^3(t)) \geq 3$. Write $t = 7s \pm 1$, $s \in \mathbb{Z}_p$. Then

$$(19 + 11t^2 + 19t^4) = 7^3(133s^4 + 76s^3 + 18s^2 + 2s) + 7^2(-s^2 + 1).$$

Thus (see (B.1)), if $s \not\equiv \pm 1 \bmod 7$,

$$v_7(f_1^3(t) - f_2^3(t)) = 3, \tag{B.12}$$

and then

$$v_7(c_4(t)) \geq 2 + 2 \cdot 3 = 8, \quad v_7(c_6(t)) \geq 3 + 3 \cdot 3 = 12, \quad v_7(\Delta(t)) \geq 8 \cdot 3 = 24.$$

We set $c_4' = (7^2)^{-4} c_4(t)$, $c_6' = (7^2)^{-6} c_6(t)$, $\Delta' = (7^2)^{-12} \Delta(t)$. Then

$$v_7(c_4') \geq 0, \qquad v_7(c_6') \geq 0, \qquad v_7(\Delta') = 0.$$

This is a minimal integral model. (At a place $p \neq 2, 3$, the model is integral if and only if $v_p(c_4)$ and $v_p(c_6)$ are both non-negative.) Hence the curve has good reduction at 7, and so

$$W_7(\mathscr{E}(t)) = 1$$

for all $t \in \mathbb{Q}_7$ with $v_7(t) = 0$, $t \equiv \pm 1 \bmod 7$, $t \not\equiv \pm 7 \pm 1 \bmod 49$.

Suppose now that $s \equiv \pm 1 \bmod 7$. Then

$$v_7(f_1^3(t) - f_2^3(t)) \geq 4.$$

On the other hand, a brief calculation shows that now $v_7(f_1(t)) = 1$, $v_7(f_2(t)) = 1$ and $v_7(f_1^3(t) + f_1^3(t)) = 3$. Define $k = v_7(f_1^3(t) - f_2^3(t))$. Then

$$v_7(c_4(t)) \geq 2 + 2 \cdot k, \qquad v_7(c_6(t)) \geq 3 + 3 \cdot k, \qquad v_7(\Delta(t)) \geq 8 \cdot k$$

Hence, if k is even, the reduction of $\mathscr{E}(t)$ is additive and potentially multiplicative, and so

$$W(\mathscr{E}(t)) = (-1/7) = -1;$$

if k is odd, the reduction of $\mathscr{E}(t)$ is multiplicative, and so, by (6.4),

$$W(\mathscr{E}(t)) = -((-7^{-v_7(c_6(t))} c_6(t))/7).$$

This is all about the particular case $t \equiv \pm 7 \pm 1 \bmod 49$.

It remains to consider the case $v_7(t) < 0$. Let $k = -v_7(t)$. Then $v_7(f_1(t)) = -2k$, $v_7(f_2(t)) = -2k$, $v_7(f_1^3(t) + f_2^3(t)) = -6k$, $v_7(f_1^3(t) - f_2^3(t)) = -6k + 1$. Hence

$$v_7(c_4(t)) = -16k + 2, \qquad v_7(c_6(t)) = -24k + 3, \qquad v_7(\Delta(t)) = -48k + 8,$$

and so a minimal integral model has parameters c_4', c_6', Δ' with

$$v_7(c_4(t)) = 2, \qquad v_7(c_6(t)) = 3, \qquad v_7(c_6(t)) = 8.$$

Thus, the reduction of $\mathscr{E}(t)$ is additive and potentially multiplicative, and so

$$W(\mathscr{E}(t)) = (-1/7) = -1.$$

We summarise: for $t \in \mathbb{Q}_7$, unless $v_7(t) = 0$ and $t \equiv \pm 1 \bmod 7$, we have

$$W_7(\mathscr{E}(t)) = (-1/7) = -1. \tag{B.13}$$

If $v_7(t) = 0$ and $t \equiv \pm 1 \bmod 7$,

$$W_7(\mathscr{E}(t)) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } v_7(u(t)) = 3, \\ (-1/7) = -1 & \text{if } v_7(u(t)) \geq 4 \text{ and } v_7(u(t)) \text{ is even}, \\ -(-7^{-v_7(c_6(t))} c_6(t)/7) & \text{if } v_7(u(t)) \geq 5 \text{ and } v_7(u(t)) \text{ is odd}, \end{cases} \tag{B.14}$$

where we define $u(t) = f_1^3(t) - f_2^3(t)$.

B.2.4. *The root number at $p = 5$.* Assume first that $v_5(t) > 0$. Then $v_5(f_1(t)) = 1$, $v_5(f_2(t)) = 0$, $v_5(f_1^3(t) - f_2^3(t)) = 0$. Hence the reduction is good, and so $W_5(\mathscr{E}(t)) = 1$.

Suppose now that $v_5(t) = 0$. Then $v_5(f_1(t)) = 0$ and $v_5(f_2(t)) = 0$. Since $19 + 11t^2 + 19t^4 \equiv 0 \bmod 5$ has no roots in $\mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z}$, (B.1) implies that

$$v_5(f_1^3(t) - f_2^3(t)) = v_5(1 + t^2).$$

Now, $v_5(1+t^2) > 0$ implies $t \equiv \pm 2 \bmod 5$, and this, in turn, implies that $v_5(f_1^3(t)+f_2^3(t)) = 0$. Thus, the reduction is additive and potentially multiplicative if $v_5(f_1^3(t)-f_2^3(t))$ is odd, and multiplicative if $v_5(f_1^3(t) - f_2^3(t))$ is positive and even. By Prop. 6.1, this means that

$$W_5(\mathscr{E}(t)) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } v_5(f_1^3(t) - f_2^3(t)) = 0, \\ (-1/5) = 1 & \text{if } v_5(f_1^3(t) - f_2^3(t)) \text{ is odd and positive,} \\ -(-5^{v_5(c_6(t))} c_6(t)/5) & \text{if } v_5(f_1^3(t) - f_2^3(t)) \text{ is even and positive} \end{cases}$$

for all $t \in \mathbb{Q}_5$ with $v_5(t) = 0$.

Lastly, suppose $v_5(t) < 0$. Let $k = -v_5(t)$. Then $v(f_1(t)) = -2k$, $v(f_2(t)) = -2k + 1$, $v(f_1^3(t) + f_2^3(t)) = -6k$, $v(f_1^3(t) - f_2^3(t)) = -6k$. Hence

$$v_5(c_4(t)) = -16k + 1, \qquad v_5(c_6(t)) = -24k, \qquad v_5(\Delta(t)) = -48k.$$

Thus, the reduction at $p = 5$ is good, and $W(\mathscr{E}(t)) = 1$.

We conclude that, for all $t \in \mathbb{Q}_5$,

$$W_5(\mathscr{E}(t)) = \begin{cases} -(-5^{-v_5(c_6(t))} c_6(t)/5) & \text{if } v_5(f_1^3(t) - f_2^3(t)) \text{ is even and positive,} \\ (-1/5) = 1 & \text{if } v_5(f_1^3(t) - f_2^3(t)) \text{ is odd and positive,} \\ 1 & \text{if } v_5(f_1^3(t) - f_2^3(t)) \leq 0. \end{cases}$$

As we will later see, this is exactly the sort of thing that happens for every p outside the finite set $\{2, 3, 5, 7, 13, 19\}$.

B.2.5. *The root number at $p = 13$.* Assume first that $v_{13}(t) \geq 0$. Then $v_{13}(19 + 11t^2 + 19t^4) = 0$, and so $v(f_1^3(t)-f_2^3(t)) = v(1+t^2)$. If $v(1+t^2) > 0$, then $v(f_1(t)) = 0$, $v(f_2(t)) = 0$ and $v(f_1^3(t)+f_2^3(t)) = 0$. Hence, the reduction at $p = 13$ is good if $v_{13}(f_1^3(t)-f_2^3(t)) = 0$, additive and potentially multiplicative if $v_{13}(f_1^3(t) - f_2^3(t))$ is odd, and multiplicative if $v_{13}(f_1^3(t) - f_2^3(t))$ is positive and even. By Prop. 6.1, this means that

$$W_{13}(\mathscr{E}(t)) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } v_{13}(f_1^3(t) - f_2^3(t)) = 0, \\ (-1/13) = 1 & \text{if } v_{13}(f_1^3(t) - f_2^3(t)) \text{ is odd and positive,} \\ -(-13^{v_{13}(c_6(t))} c_6(t)/13) & \text{if } v_{13}(f_1^3(t) - f_2^3(t)) \text{ is even and positive} \end{cases}$$

for all $t \in \mathbb{Q}_{13}$ with $v_{13}(t) \geq 0$.

Assume, lastly, that $v_{13}(t) < 0$. Let $k = -v_{13}(t)$. Then $v_{13}(f_1(t)) = -2k$, $v_{13}(f_2(t)) = -2k$, $v_{13}(f_1(t)^3 + f_2(t)^3) = -6k + 1$, $v_{13}(f_1(t)^3 - f_2(t)^3) = -6k$. Thus,

$$v(c_4(t)) = -16k, \qquad v(c_6(t)) = -24k + 1, \qquad v(\Delta(t)) = -48k.$$

Thus, the reduction at 13 is good, and so $W_{13}(\mathscr{E}(t)) = 1$.

We conclude that

$$W_{13}(\mathscr{E}(t)) = \begin{cases} -(-13^{-v_{13}(c_6(t))} c_6(t)/13) & \text{if } v_{13}(f_1^3(t) - f_2^3(t)) \text{ is even and positive,} \\ (-1/13) = 1 & \text{if } v_{13}(f_1^3(t) - f_2^3(t)) \text{ is odd and positive,} \\ 1 & \text{if } v_{13}(f_1^3(t) - f_2^3(t)) \leq 0 \end{cases}$$

for all $t \in \mathbb{Q}_{13}$ with $v_{13}(t) = 0$. Again, here as for $p = 5$, the behaviour of the local root number is as it is at a prime $p \notin \{2, 3, 5, 7, 13, 19\}$.

B.2.6. *The root number at $p = 19$.* Assume first that $v_{19}(t) > 0$. Then $v_{19}(f_1(t)) = 0$, $v_{19}(f_2(t)) = 0$, $v_{19}(f_1^3(t) + f_2^3(t)) = 0$ and (by (B.1)) $v_{19}(f_1^3(t) - f_2^3(t)) = 1$. Hence

$$v_{19}(c_4(t)) = 2, \qquad v_{19}(c_6(t)) = 3, \qquad v_{19}(\Delta(t)) = 8.$$

Thus, the reduction type is additive and potentially multiplicative. The root number is hence

$$W_{19}(\mathscr{E}(t)) = (-1/19) = -1.$$

Suppose now that $v_{19}(t) = 0$. Because -1 is not a quadratic residue $\bmod 19$, we know that $v_{19}(f_1^3(t) - f_2^3(t)) = 0$, and thus $v_{19}(\Delta(t)) = 0$. At the same time, $v_{19}(c_4(t)) \geq 0$ and $v_{19}(f_6(t)) \geq 0$. Hence, the reduction at 19 is good, and so $W_{19}(\mathscr{E}(t)) = 1$.

Suppose now that $v_{19}(t) < 0$. Let $k = -v_{19}(t)$. Then $v_{19}(f_1(t)) = -2k$, $v_{19}(f_2(t)) = -2k$, $v_{19}(f_1^3(t) - f_2^3(t)) = -6k$, $v_{19}(f_1^3(t) - f_2^3(t)) = -6k + 1$. Hence

$$v_{19}(c_4(t)) = -16k + 2, \qquad v_{19}(c_6(t)) = -24k + 3, \qquad v_{19}(\Delta(t)) = -48k + 8.$$

Thus, the reduction type is additive and potentially multiplicative. We obtain

$$W_{19}(\mathscr{E}(t)) = (-1/19) = -1.$$

In general, we can now conclude,

$$W_{19}(\mathscr{E}(t)) = \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if } v_{19}(t) \neq 0, \\ 1 & \text{if } v_{19}(t) = 0 \end{cases} \tag{B.15}$$

for all $t \in \mathbb{Q}_p$.

B.2.7. *The local root number at a prime $p \notin \{2, 3, 5, 7, 13, 19\}$.* Assume first that $v_p(t) \geq 0$. Let $k = v_p(f_1^3(t) - f_2^3(t))$. Since only primes in $\{2, 3, 5, 7, 13, 19\}$ can derive a resultant $\operatorname{Res}(P_i, P_j)$, $1 \leq i < j \leq 8$ (see (B.4)), we conclude that, for $k \geq 0$,

$$v_p(c_4(t)) = 2k, \qquad v_p(c_6(t)) = 3k, \qquad v_p(\Delta(t)) = 8k.$$

Hence, the reduction at p is good if $v_p(f_1^3(t) - f_2^3(t)) = 0$, additive and potentially multiplicative if $v_p(f_1^3(t) - f_2^3(t))$ is odd, and multiplicative if $v_p(f_1^3(t) - f_2^3(t))$ is positive and even. Thus

$$W_p(\mathscr{E}(t)) = \begin{cases} -(-p^{v_p(c_6(t))} c_6(t)/p) & \text{if } v_p(f_1^3(t) - f_2^3(t)) \text{ is even and positive,} \\ (-1/p)^{v_p(f_1^3(t) - f_2^3(t))} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

for all $t \in \mathbb{Z}_p$.

Assume now that $v_p(t) < 0$. Let $k = -v_p(t)$. Then

$$v_{19}(c_4(t)) = -16k, \qquad v_{19}(c_6(t)) = -24k, \qquad v_{19}(\Delta(t)) = -48k.$$

Thus, the reduction at p is good, and so

$$W(\mathscr{E}(t)) = 1$$

for all $t \in \mathbb{Q}_t$ with $v_p(t) < 0$.

We conclude that, for $p \notin \{2, 3, 5, 7, 13, 19\}$,

$$W_p(\mathscr{E}(t)) = \begin{cases} -(-p^{-v_p(c_6(t))} c_6(t)/p) & \text{if } v_p(f_1^3(t) - f_2^3(t)) \text{ is even and positive,} \\ (-1/p) & \text{if } v_p(f_1^3(t) - f_2^3(t)) \text{ is odd and positive,} \\ 1 & \text{if } v_p(f_1^3(t) - f_2^3(t)) \leq 0 \end{cases} \tag{B.16}$$

for all $t \in \mathbb{Q}_p$. As we saw before, this is also true for $p = 5, 13$.

B.3. **The global root number.** We must compute the global root number

$$W(\mathscr{E}(t)) = \prod_v W_v(\mathscr{E}(t)) = -\prod_p W_p(\mathscr{E}(t)).$$

First, we separate what we may see as the "main term", speaking loosely. This is the contribution that each prime $p \neq 2,3,7,19$ would make if $v_p(f_1^3(t) - f_2^3(t))$ were ≤ 1, as is the case for all but finitely many primes. For each prime $p \neq 2,3,7,19$ with $v_p(f_1^3(t) - f_2^3(t)) \leq 1$,

$$W_p(\mathscr{E}(t)) = \begin{cases} (-1/p) & \text{if } v_p(f_1^3(t) - f_2^3(t)) \text{ is odd and positive,} \\ 1 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \tag{B.17}$$

by our case-work above. Thus, we would like to determine

$$V = \prod_{\substack{p\neq 2,3,7,19 \\ v_p(f_1^3(t)-f_2^3(t))\geq 0}} (-1/p)^{v_p(f_1^3(t)-f_2^3(t))}$$

for all $t \in \mathbb{Q}$.

Write $t = \frac{t_0}{t_1}$, where t_0 and t_1 are coprime integers. Then

$$\begin{aligned} f_1^3(t) - f_2^3(t) &= (-5 - 2(t_0/t_1)^2)^3 - (2 + 5(t_0/t_1)^2)^3 \\ &= \frac{1}{t_1^6} \cdot -7(19t_1^4 + 11t_1^2t_0^2 + 19t_0^4)(t_1^2 + t_0^2). \end{aligned}$$

Let

$$P(x,y) = -7(19y^4 + 11y^2x^2 + 19x^4)(y^2 + x^2).$$

If $p|y$ and $p \neq 7, 19$, then, since x and y are coprime,

$$v_p(7(19y^4 + 11x^2y^2 + 19x^4)(y^2 + x^2)) = 0. \tag{B.18}$$

Hence, if $v_p(P(t_0,t_1)) > 0$, then $p \nmid t_1$. It follows that, for $p \neq 7, 19$, $v_p(f_1^3(t) - f_2^3(t)) \geq 0$ implies $v_p(f_1^3(t) - f_2^3(t)) = v_p(P(t_0,t_1))$, and, again for $p \neq 7,19$, $v_p(P(t_0,t_1)) > 0$ implies $v_p(f_1^3(t) - f_2^3(t)) \geq 0$ and $v_p(f_1^3(t) - f_2^3(t)) = v_p(P(t_0,t_1))$. Hence

$$V = \prod_{p\neq 2,3,7,19} (-1/p)^{v_p(P(t_0,t_1))}. \tag{B.19}$$

(In the notation we introduced in §(5.7), this can be rewritten as

$$V = (-1|P(t_0,t_1))_d,$$

where $d = 2 \cdot 3 \cdot 7 \cdot 19$.)

Here comes a key step. By the quadratic reciprocity law,

$$\prod_{p\neq 2} (-1/p)^{v_p(P(t_0,t_1))} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } a \equiv 1 \bmod 4, \\ -1 & \text{if } a \equiv -1 \bmod 4, \end{cases} \tag{B.20}$$

where $a = \prod_{p\neq 2} p^{v_p(P(t_0,t_1))}$. (Actually, what we need here is not the full law of quadratic reciprocity, but only the fact that $(-1/p) = 1$ if and only if $p \equiv 1 \bmod 4$.)

Since t_0 and t_1 are coprime, they cannot both be even. If one of them is even, then $2 \nmid P(t_0,t_1)$, and so a is the absolute value $|P(t_0,t_1)|$ of $P(t_0,t_1)$. In that case,

$$\begin{aligned} |P(t_0,t_1)| &= 7(19t_1^4 + 11t_0^2t_1^2 + 19t_0^4)(t_1^2 + t_0^2) \\ &\equiv 3(3t_1^4 + 3t_0^2t_1^2 + 3t_0^4)(t_1^2 + t_0^2) \bmod 4 \\ &\equiv 1 \bmod 4. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by (B.20),

$$\prod_{p\neq 2} (-1/p)^{v_p(P(t_0,t_1))} = 1$$

when exactly one of t_0, t_1 is odd and the other one is even.

Suppose now that t_0 and t_1 are both odd. Then $t_1^2 + t_0^2 \equiv 2 \bmod 4$, and so $|P(t_0,t_1)| \equiv 2 \bmod 4$. Now

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{|P(t_0,t_1)|}{2} &= 7(19t_1^4 + 11t_0^2t_1^2 + 19t_0^4)\cdot\frac{t_1^2+t_0^2}{2}\\ &\equiv 3(3t_1^4 + 3t_0^2t_1^2 + 3t_0^4)\cdot 1 \bmod 4\\ &\equiv 3 \bmod 4.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, by (B.20),

$$\prod_{p\neq 2} (-1/p)^{v_p(P(t_0,t_1))} = -1$$

when t_0, t_1 are both odd.

Looking back at (B.19), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} V = \prod_{p\neq 2,3,7,19} (-1/p)^{v_p(P(t_0,t_1))} &= \prod_{p=3,7,19} (-1/p)^{v_p(P(t_0,t_1))} \cdot \prod_{p\neq 2} (-1/p)^{v_p(P(t_0,t_1))}\\ &= \prod_{p=3,7,19} (-1/p)^{v_p(P(t_0,t_1))} \cdot \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if } t_0,\ t_1 \text{ are both odd}\\ 1 & \text{otherwise.}\end{cases}\end{aligned} \tag{B.21}$$

We can now write

$$\begin{aligned} W(\mathscr{E}(t)) &= -\prod_p W_p(\mathscr{E}(t))\\ &= -\prod_{p=2,3,7,19} W_p(\mathscr{E}(t)) \cdot \prod_{p\neq 2,3,7,19} W_p(\mathscr{E}(t))\\ &= -\prod_{p=2,3,7,19} W_p(\mathscr{E}(t)) \cdot \prod_{p\neq 2,3,7,19} \frac{W_p(\mathscr{E}(t))}{(-1/p)^{v_p(P(t_0,t_1)}} \cdot V\\ &= -W_2(\mathscr{E}(t)) \cdot \prod_{p=3,7,19} W_p(\mathscr{E}(t)) \cdot (-1/p)^{v_p(P(t_0,t_1))}\\ &\quad \cdot \prod_{p\neq 2,3,7,19} \frac{W_p(\mathscr{E}(t))}{(-1/p)^{v_p(P(t_0,t_1))}} \cdot \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if } t_0,\ t_1 \text{ are both odd}\\ 1 & \text{otherwise.}\end{cases}\end{aligned} \tag{B.22}$$

We define

$$\begin{aligned} g_\infty(x,y) &= -1 \qquad \text{for all } x,y \in \mathbb{R},\\ g_2(x,y) &= W_2(\mathscr{E}(x/y)) \cdot \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if } x,\ y \text{ are both odd}\\ 1 & \text{otherwise.}\end{cases}\\ g_p(x,y) &= W_p(\mathscr{E}(x/y)) \cdot (-1/p)^{v_p(P(x,y))} \qquad \text{for } p = 3,7,19.\end{aligned} \tag{B.23}$$

and

$$h_p(x,y) = \frac{W_p(\mathscr{E}(t))}{(-1/p)^{v_p(P(x,y))}} \tag{B.24}$$

for $p \neq 2, 3, 7, 19$. By (B.17) and the discussion after (B.18), $h_p(x, y) = 1$ whenever $p^2 \nmid P(x, y)$. We now rewrite (B.22) as follows:

$$W(\mathscr{E}(x/y)) = \prod_{v \in \{\infty,2,3,7,19\}} g_v(x, y) \cdot \prod_{\substack{p \notin \{2,3,7,19\} \\ p^2 | P(x,y)}} h_p(x, y),$$

for all coprime x, y, where $P(x, y) = -7(19y^4 + 11y^2x^2 + 19x^4)(y^2 + x^2)$. This is simply a special case of Thm. 6.6, (6.19).

Why could we not have simply invoked Thm. 6.6? Theorem 6.6 does not give explicit expressions for g_v and h_p. We have found g_v and h_p in our example by, in effect, following the proofs of Prop. 6.3, Prop. 6.5 and Thm. 6.6.

The functions g_v, h_p are given by the expressions in (B.23) and (B.24), combined with the work we did before on local root numbers. Let us now make these expressions more explicit. It is here that the results of the lengthy casework in §B.2 finally enter.

Let us first look at $p = 2$. For x and y coprime, $v_2(x/y) > 0$ if x is even and y is odd, $v_2(x/y) = 0$ if they are both odd and $v_2(x/y) < 0$ if x is odd and y is even. Hence, by (B.8) and (B.23),

$$g_2(x, y) = \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if } x \text{ is even and } y \text{ is odd,} \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{B.25}$$

Let us now look at $p = 3$. By (B.10) and (B.23),

$$g_3(x, y) = W_3(\mathscr{E}(x/y)) \cdot (-1/3)^{v_3(P(x,y))} = (-1/3)^{v_3(P(x,y))}.$$

A brief examination suffices to show that $v_3(P(x, y)) = 0$ for all coprime x, y, and so

$$g_3(x, y) = 1 \tag{B.26}$$

identically for all coprime x, y.

Consider now $p = 7$. A brief calculation shows that $v_7(P(x, y)) = v_7(-7(19y^4+11y^2x^2+19x^4)(y^2 + x^2)) = 1 + v_7(19y^4 + 11y^2x^2 + 19x^4)$. If $v_7(19y^4 + 11y^2x^2 + 19x^4) = 0$, then, by (B.23) and (B.13),

$$g_7(x, y) = W_7(\mathscr{E}(x/y)) \cdot (-1/7)^{v_7(P(x,y))} = (-1) \cdot (-1) = 1. \tag{B.27}$$

Suppose that $v_7(19y^4 + 11y^2x^2 + 19x^4) > 0$. Then $v_7(x/y) = 0$ and $x/y \equiv \pm 1 \bmod 7$. Write $x/y = 7s \pm 1$, $s \in \mathbb{Z}_p$. If $s \not\equiv \pm 1 \bmod 7$, we are in the case of equation (B.12), and so

$$g_7(x, y) = W_7(\mathscr{E}(x/y)) \cdot (-1/7)^{v_7(P(x,y))} = (1) \cdot (-1) = -1. \tag{B.28}$$

If $s \equiv \pm 1 \bmod 7$, then $v_7(P(x, y)) \geq 4$, and so, by (B.14),

$$g_7(x, y) = W_7(\mathscr{E}(x/y)) \cdot (-1/7)^{v_7(P(x,y))} = (-1) \cdot (-1)^{v_7(P(x,y))} = -1 \tag{B.29}$$

if $v_7(P(x, y))$ is even,

(B.30)
$$\begin{aligned} g_7(x, y) &= W_7(\mathscr{E}(x/y)) \cdot (-1/7)^{v_7(P(x,y))} = -(-7^{-v_7(c_6(x/y))}c_6(x/y)/7) \cdot (-1)^{v_7(P(x,y))} \\ &= (-7^{-v_7(c_6(x/y))}c_6(x/y)/7) \end{aligned}$$

if $v_7(P(x, y))$ is odd.

Lastly, let us look at $p = 19$. Looking at $P(x, y) = -7(19y^4+11y^2x^2+19x^4)(y^2+x^2)$, we see that $v_{19}(P(x, y)) = 1$ if either $19|x$ or $19|y$ (and x and y are coprime) and $v_{19}(x, y) = 0$ if $19 \nmid x$ and $19 \nmid y$. Hence, by (B.15) and (B.23),

$$g_{19}(x, y) = W_{19}(\mathscr{E}(x/y)) \cdot (-1/19)^{v_{19}(P(x,y))} = 1. \tag{B.31}$$

Having examined the functions g_p, $p \in \{2,3,7,19\}$, we now look at the functions h_p, $p \notin \{2,3,7,19\}$. By (B.16) and (B.24),
(B.32)

$$h_p(x,y) = \frac{W_p(\mathscr{E}(x/y))}{(-1/p)^{v_p(P(x,y))}} = \begin{cases} -(p^{-v_p(c_6(x/y))}c_6(x/y)/p) & \text{if } v_p(P(x,y)) \text{ is even and } \geq 2, \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

B.4. **Computing p-adic integrals.** By (B.25), (B.26) and (B.31),

$$\int_{O_2} g_2(x,y)dxdy = \frac{1}{4},$$

$$\int_{O_3} g_3(x,y)dxdy = \text{Area}(O_3) = 1 - \frac{1}{9}, \qquad \int_{O_{19}} g_{19}(x,y)dxdy = 1 - \frac{1}{19^2}.$$

Recall that $O_p = (\mathbb{Z}_p \times \mathbb{Z}_p) \setminus (p\mathbb{Z}_p \times p\mathbb{Z}_p)$.

Before looking at the integral $\int_{O_7} g_7(x,y)dxdy$ of $g_7(x,y)$, let us look at the integral of $h_p(x,y)$, $p \neq 2,3,7,19$.

If $p^2 \nmid P(x,y)$, where $P(x,y) = -7(19y^4 + 11y^2x^2 + 19x^4)(x^2+y^2)$, then $h_p(x,y) = 1$. Assume $p^2|P(x,y)$. We consult the short list (B.5) of prime factors of determinants and conclude that $p \nmid P_j(x,y)$ for every $1 \leq j \leq 7$, $j \neq 5,6$, where the polynomials P_j are as in (B.3). The assumption $p^2|P(x,y)$ also implies that $v_p(x/y) = 0$ and so $p \nmid P_8(x,y) = y$. We thus see from (B.6) that, for $(x,y) \in O_p$ with $p^2|P(x/y)$ and $x, y \bmod p$ given, the quantity $p^{-v_p(c_6(x/y))}c_6(x/y) \bmod p$ equals a constant in $(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^*$ times $p^{-3v_p(P(x/y,1))}P(x/y,1)^3 \mod p$. In particular, $(p^{-v_p(c_6(x/y))}c_6(x/y)/p)$ equal a constant $\in \{-1,1\}$ times $(p^{-v_p(P(x/y,1))}P(x/y,1) \bmod p$. Let $f(t) = P(t,1)$.

Since $p \neq 2,3,7,19$, the discriminant of f is not divisible by p. Then $p^2|f(t)$ (or, for that matter, $p|f(t)$) implies $p \nmid f'(t)$. Hence, for t such that $v_p(t-t_0) > 0$ for some root t_0 of $f = 0$,

$$f(t) = f'(t)(t-t_0) + g(t)(t-t_0)^2,$$

where $v(g(t)) \geq 0$, and so

$$p^{-v_p(t)}f(t) \equiv f'(t) \cdot p^{-v_p(t-t_0)}(t-t_0) \bmod p.$$

It follows that, as t ranges over all values of $t \in \mathbb{Q}_p$ with $v_p(t-t_0)$ given, the integral of $(p^{-v_p(t)}f(t)/p)$ is 0. (Here we are using the fact that $\sum_{a=1}^{p-1}(a/p) = 0$.) Since $p \nmid \text{Disc}(f)$, the roots t_0 of $f = 0$ are not congruent to each other modulo p, and so the integral of $(p^{-v_p(t)}f(t)/p)$ over all t such that $v_p(f(t)) = k$ ($k > 0$ arbitrary) is zero.

Hence, the integral of $(p^{-v_p(c_6(x/y))}c_6(x/y)/p) \bmod p$ over all pairs $(x,y) \in O_p$ with $v_p(P(x,y)) = k$, k given and positive, is 0. Working from (B.32), we see that, for $p \neq 2,3,7,19$,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{O_p} h_p(x,y) &= \text{Area}(O_p) - a_p \cdot \sum_{\substack{k \geq 2 \\ k \text{ even}}} p^{-k}(1-p^{-1}) \\ &= (1-p^{-2}) - a_p \frac{p^{-2}(1-p^{-1})}{1-p^{-2}},\end{aligned}$$

where a_p is the number of roots of $f(t) = 0$ in $\mathbb{Q}_p$. Since $p \nmid \text{Disc}(f)$, a_p equals the number of roots of the equation

$$(19t^4 + 11t^2 + 19)(t^2+1) \equiv 0 \bmod p$$

in $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$.

We can now go back to $p = 7$. It is much the same story, only that, since p does divide $\text{Disc}(f)$, we need to treat $v_p(f(t))$ positive and small as a collection of special cases - and that is exactly what we did in §B.2.3. (Because $p|\operatorname{Disc}(f)$, some of the roots t_i, t_j of $f(t) = 0$ are close to each other: $v(t_i - t_j) > 0$. We saw in §B.2.3 that the roots are not very close to each other: there are four distinct roots t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4, and they satisfy $v(t_i - t_j)$ is 1 or 2 for all $1 \leq i < j \leq 4$.)

Looking at (B.27)–(B.30) and working as we did for h_p, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{O_7} g_7(x,y) &= 1 \cdot (1 - 7^{-2} - 2(1-7^{-1})7^{-1}) + (-1) \cdot (2(1-7^{-1})7^{-1}(1 - 2 \cdot 7^{-1}))\\ &+ (-1) \cdot 4(1-7^{-1})7^{-2} \cdot \sum_{\substack{k \geq 0\\ k \text{ even}}} (1-7^{-1})7^{-k}\\ &+ 0 \cdot 4(1-7^{-1})7^{-2} \cdot \sum_{\substack{k \geq 0\\ k \text{ odd}}} (1-7^{-1})7^{-k}\\ &= (1 - 2 \cdot 7^{-1} + 7^{-2}) + (-1) \cdot (2 \cdot 7^{-1} - 6 \cdot 7^{-2} + 4 \cdot 7^{-3})\\ &+ (-1) \cdot 4 \frac{(1-7^{-1})^2 7^{-2}}{1 - 7^{-2}}\\ &= 1 - 4 \cdot 7^{-1} + 7 \cdot 7^{-2} - 4 \cdot 7^{-3} - \frac{4(1-7^{-1})^2 7^{-2}}{1-7^{-2}}\\ &= \frac{171}{343} = \frac{3^2 \cdot 19}{7^3}.\end{aligned}$$

Lastly, recall that, by (B.23), $g_\infty(x,y) = -1$ identically.

B.5. **Conclusion.** We can now apply Proposition 7.8. (Our polynomial

$$B_{\mathscr{E}} = (19y^4 + 11y^2x^2 + 19x^4)(y^2 + x^2)$$

is a product of irreducible polynomials of degree ≤ 4. Thus, by [18], Prop. 4.12, hypothesis $\mathscr{A}_2(B_{\mathscr{E}})$ holds, and thus Proposition 7.8 holds unconditionally.) We obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{av}_{\mathbb{Q}} W(\mathscr{E}(x/y)) &= -1 \cdot \frac{1/4}{1-2^{-2}} \cdot \frac{1 - 1/9}{1 - 3^{-2}} \cdot \frac{171/343}{1-7^{-2}} \cdot \frac{1 - 1/19^2}{1 - 19^{-2}}\\ &\cdot \prod_{p \neq 2,3,7,19} \frac{1 - p^{-2} - a_p \frac{p^{-2}}{1-p^{-2}}(1-p^{-1})}{1-p^{-2}},\end{aligned}$$

i.e.,

$$\operatorname{av}_{\mathbb{Q}} W(\mathscr{E}(x/y)) = \frac{-19}{112} \cdot \prod_{p \neq 2,3,7,19} \left(1 - a_p \frac{p^{-2}(1-p^{-1})}{(1-p^{-2})^2}\right), \tag{B.33}$$

where a_p is the number of roots of the equation

$$(19t^4 + 11t^2 + 19)(t^2 + 1) \equiv 0 \bmod p$$

in $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$.

Numerically,

$$\operatorname{av}_{\mathbb{Q}} W(\mathscr{E}(x/y)) = -0.15294\ldots \tag{B.34}$$

We can compare this asymptotic result to the average of $W(\mathscr{E}(x/y))$ over all rationals x/y, $\gcd(x,y) = 1$, $|x|, |y| \leq N$. A program running on SAGE gives an average of $-0.15529\ldots$ for $N = 500$ and an average of -0.155428 for $N = 1500$.

Appendix C. Two-parameter families

Every elliptic curve E over $\mathbb{Q}$ can be written in the form $E : y^2 = x^3 + ax + b$, with a, b integral. Thus, the most natural two-parameter family of elliptic curves over $\mathbb{Q}$ is $\mathscr{E} : (a, b) \mapsto (y^2 = x^3 + ax + b)$. Unfortunately, the problem of averaging the root number over that family $\mathscr{E}$ seems to necessitate solving an open case of the parity problem; to put a remark in [37], §1, in the language of this paper, we would in all likelihood need to show that $\lambda(a^2 - b^3)$ averages to zero as a and b vary over $\mathbb{Z}$. In the face of [11], one may think that showing as much is not completely out of reach, but, as of now, proving that $\lambda(a^2 - b^3)$ averages to zero presents, at the very least, some serious technical difficulties, and thus remains open.

We can, however, give unconditional statements for some other two-parameter families. Consider the elliptic curves of the form $\mathscr{E}(a, b) : y^2 = x(x + a)(x + b)$ for $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$. This family is of some interest, as every semisimple elliptic curve over $\mathbb{Q}$ with full rational 2-torsion $(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^2$ is isomorphic over $\mathbb{Q}$ to $\mathscr{E}(a, b)$ for some $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$. We can, in fact, assume that $\gcd(a, b)$ is square-free, as $\mathscr{E}(ap^2, bp^2)$ is isomorphic to $\mathscr{E}(a, b)$.

We will now show that $W(\mathscr{E}(a, b))$ averages to zero. Here a, b will go through all non-zero integers with $\gcd(a, b) = 1$. The condition $\gcd(a, b) = 1$ is there for the sake of simplicity; the same methods would suffice to compute the average over all $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ with some more work.

The proof will give us another opportunity to use one of the cases of the parity problem solved in [20]: for a, b varying over the all integers with $\gcd(a, b) = 1$, the expression

$$(a|b) \cdot \lambda(ab(a - b))$$

averages to zero. Here $(a|b) = \prod_{p|b,\, p \text{ odd}} (a/p)^{v_p(b)}$, where $(\cdot/\cdot)$ is the quadratic reciprocity symbol: $(a/p) = 1$ if $a \in (\mathbb{Q}_p^*)^2$, $(a/p) = 1$ if $a \in \mathbb{Q}_p \setminus (\mathbb{Q}_p^*)^2$.

Recall that the Liouville function λ is defined by $\lambda(n) = \prod_p (-1)^{v_p(n)}$. We write $\operatorname{rad}(n)$ for the radical $\operatorname{rad}(n) = \prod_{p|n} p$ of an integer n.

Lemma C.1. *For any $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ non-zero and coprime, the elliptic curve $E_{a,b} : y^2 = x(x + a)(x + b)$ satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{W(E_{a,b})}{W_2(E_{a,b})} = &- \prod_{p|b,\, p \text{ odd}} (a/p) \cdot \prod_{p|a,\, p \text{ odd}} (b/p) \cdot \prod_{p|(b-a),\, p \text{ odd}} (-a/p) \\ &\cdot \prod_{p|(ab(a-b))} (-1),\end{aligned} \tag{C.1}$$

where $W(E)$ is the (global) root number and W_2 is the local root number at 2.

Proof. A model of the form $y^2 = x^3 + C_2 x_2 + C_1 x_1 + C_0$ is minimal at an odd prime p if $\min_{j=0,1,2}(v_p(C_j)) = 0$. (This is so because the passage from a model of this form to a long Weierstrass form (and vice versa) is integral over p odd; see [36, §III.1].) Since a and b are coprime, the model $y^2 = x(x + a)(x + b) = x^3 + (a + b)x^2 + abx$ is minimal at every odd prime p.

Let p be an odd prime. We see from our minimal model $y^2 = x(x + a)(x + b)$ that the curve $E_{a,b}$ has good reduction at p if $p \nmid ab(a - b)$, and multiplicative reduction at p if $p|ab(a - b)$. Suppose, then, that $p|ab(a - b)$. The reduced curve $\widehat{E_{a,b}}$ over $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ is given by $y^2 = x^2(x + b)$ for $p|a$, by $y^2 = x^2(x + a)$ for $p|b$, and by $y^2 = x(x + a)(x + a)$ for $p|b - a$. Hence, for p odd, the reduction is split iff b is a square mod p (for $p|a$), iff a is a square mod p (for $p|b$), iff $-a$ is a square mod p (for $p|b - a$). Since $W_p(E_{a,b}) = -1$

when the reduction is split, and $W_p(E_{a,b}) = 1$ when it is not, the statement follows by $W(E) = -\prod_p W_p(E)$. $\square$

Let us simplify (C.1) a little. First of all, we notice that

$$\begin{aligned}\prod_{p|b,\, p \text{ odd}} (a/p) \cdot \prod_{p|a,\, p \text{ odd}} (b/p) \cdot \prod_{p|(b-a),\, p \text{ odd}} (-a/p) \\ = \prod_{p^2|b,\, p \text{ odd}} (a/p)^{v_p(b)-1} \cdot \prod_{p^2|a,\, p \text{ odd}} (b/p)^{v_p(a)-1} \cdot \prod_{p^2|(b-a),\, p \text{ odd}} (-a/p)^{v_p(b-a)-1} \\ \cdot (a|b) \cdot (b|a) \cdot (-a|b-a).\end{aligned}$$

By (5.14) (essentially a form of the law of quadratic reciprocity),

$$\frac{(b-a|-a)}{(-a|b-a)} = \left(\frac{a,b}{\infty}\right)^{-1} \cdot \left(\frac{a,b}{2}\right)^{-1},$$

where $\left(\frac{a,b}{v}\right)$ is the quadratic Hilbert symbol (see (5.12)). (What will matter is that, by (5.12), $(a,b) \mapsto \left(\frac{a,b}{v}\right)$ depends on a and b only modulo $(K_v^*)^2$.) Now

$$(b-a|-a) = (b-a|a) = (b|a).$$

Since $(b|a) = \pm 1$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}(a|b) \cdot (b|a) \cdot (-a|b-a) &= (a|b) \cdot (b|a) \cdot (b|a) \left(\frac{a,b}{\infty}\right)^{-1} \cdot \left(\frac{a,b}{2}\right)^{-1} \\ &= \left(\frac{a,b}{\infty}\right)^{-1} \cdot \left(\frac{a,b}{2}\right)^{-1} \cdot (a|b).\end{aligned}$$

Lastly, since a and b are coprime,

$$\prod_{p|(ab(a-b))} (-1) = \lambda(ab(a-b)) \cdot \prod_{p^2|(ab(a-b))} (-1)^{v_p(ab(a-b))-1}.$$

Therefore, (C.1) implies that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{W(E_{a,b})}{W_2(E_{a,b})} = \left(\frac{a,b}{\infty}\right)^{-1} \cdot \left(\frac{a,b}{2}\right)^{-1} \cdot \prod_{p^2|b,\, p \text{ odd}} (a/p)^{v_p(b)-1} \cdot \prod_{p^2|a,\, p \text{ odd}} (b/p)^{v_p(a)-1} \\ \cdot \prod_{p^2|(b-a),\, p \text{ odd}} (-a/p)^{v_p(b-a)-1} \cdot \prod_{p^2|(ab(a-b))} (-1)^{v_p(ab(a-b))-1} \\ \cdot (a|b)\lambda(ab(a-b)).\end{aligned} \tag{C.2}$$

Proposition C.2. *For $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ coprime, let $E_{a,b}$ denote the curve $y^2 = x(x+a)(x+b)$. Let $S \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a sector and $a + L \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$ a lattice coset. Then*

$$\mathrm{av}_{S\cap(a+L),coprime}\, W(E_{a,b}) = 0.$$

Remark. Recall that the average $\mathrm{av}_{S\cap(a+L),\mathrm{coprime}}\, W(E_{a,b})$ is defined to be

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{\sum_{(a,b)\in S\cap(a+L):\ \gcd(a,b)=1} W(E_{a,b})}{|\{(a,b) \in S \cap (a+L) : \gcd(a,b) = 1\}|}.$$

Here the two terms $W(E_{0,1})$ and $W(E_{1,0})$ are ill-defined (since $E_{0,1}$ and $E_{1,0}$ are singular curves); this is irrelevant, as their contribution goes to 0 as $N \to \infty$.

Proof of Proposition C.2. The curve $y^2 = x(x+a)(x+b)$ is an elliptic curve whenever $a, b \neq 0$. Thus, by Proposition 4.2, the map $(a,b) \mapsto W_2(E_{a,b})$ is defined and locally constant everywhere on $(\mathbb{Q}_2 \setminus \{0\}) \times (\mathbb{Q}_2 \setminus \{0\})$. Hence, (C.2) can be rewritten in the following form: for all non-zero, coprime $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$W(E_{a,b}) = (g_\infty(a,b) \cdot g_2(a,b)) \cdot \prod_{p \text{ odd}} h_p(a,b) \cdot (a|b)\lambda(ab(a-b)),$$

where $g_\infty : (\mathbb{R}\setminus\{0\}) \times (\mathbb{R}\setminus\{0\}) \to \{-1,1\}$ is everywhere locally constant, $g_2 : (\mathbb{Q}_2 \setminus \{0\}) \times (\mathbb{Q}_2 \setminus \{0\}) \to \{-1,1\}$ is everywhere locally constant, and h_p is a function from $\mathbb{Q}_p \times \mathbb{Q}_p$ to $\{-1,1\}$ that (a) is defined and locally constant on the complement of the lines $x = 0$, $y = 0$, $x = y$ in the plane $\mathbb{Q}_p \times \mathbb{Q}_p$, (b) satisfies $h_p(a,b) = 1$ when $p^2 \nmid ab(a-b)$.

(Explicitly, $g_\infty(a,b) = \left(\frac{a,b}{v}\right)^{-1}$ and $g_2(a,b) = \left(\frac{a,b}{2}\right)^{-1} W_2(E_{a,b})$.)

We can now apply Proposition 7.12 with $\alpha(x,y) = (a|b)\lambda(ab(a-b))$ and $B(x,y) = xy(x-y)$. Since $xy(x-y)$ is a product of linear factors, hypothesis $\mathscr{A}_2(B(x,y))$ is true (and easy to prove). Condition (7.29) of Proposition 7.12 requires that

$$\text{av}_{S\cap(a+L),\text{coprime}}(a|b)\lambda(ab(a-b)) = 0 \tag{C.3}$$

for all sectors S and all lattice cosets $a + L$; this is true by Proposition 5.1 of [20]. □

References

[1] Cassels, J. W. S., and A. Schinzel, Selmer's conjecture and families of elliptic curves, *Bull. London Math. Soc.* **14** (1982), 345–348.

[2] Chowla, S., *The Riemann hypothesis and Hilbert's tenth problem*, *Mathematics and Its Applications*, Vol. 4, Gordon and Breach Science Publishers, New York–London–Paris, 1965.

[3] Connell, I., Calculating root numbers of elliptic curves over $\mathbb{Q}$, *Manuscripta Math.* **82** (1994), 93–104.

[4] Conrad, B., K. Conrad, and R. Gross, Prime specialisation in genus 0, *Trans. Am. Math. Soc.* **360** (2008), 2867–2908.

[5] Conrad, B., K. Conrad, and H. Helfgott, Root numbers and ranks in positive characteristic, *Adv. Math.* **198** (2005), 684–731.

[6] Conrad, B., and K. Conrad, personal communication.

[7] Deligne, P., Les constantes des équations fonctionelles des fonctions L, *Modular Functions of One Variable, II*, *SLN* 349, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1973, 501–595.

[8] Dokchitser, T., and V. Dokchitser, Root numbers of elliptic curves in residue characteristic 2, Bull. London Math. Soc. **40** (2008), 516–524.

[9] Erdős, P., Arithmetical properties of polynomials, *J. London Math. Soc.* **28** (1953), 416–425.

[10] T. Estermann, Einige Sätze über quadratfreie Zahlen, *Math. Ann.* **105** (1931), 653–662.

[11] Friedlander, J., and H. Iwaniec, Asymptotic sieve for primes, *Ann. of Math. (2)* **148** (1998), 1041–1065.

[12] Granville, A., *ABC* allows us to count squarefrees, *Internat. Math. Res. Notices* **1998**, 991-1009.

[13] Greaves, G., Power-free values of binary forms, *Quart. J. Math. Oxford* **43**(2) (1992), 45-65.

[14] Green, B., and T. Tao, Linear equations in the primes, arxiv:math/0606088.

[15] Halberstadt, E., Signes locaux des courbes elliptiques en 2 et 3, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.* **326** (1998), 1047–1052.

[16] Heath-Brown, D. R., Primes represented by $x^3 + 2y^3$, *Acta Math.* 186 (2001), 1–84.

[17] Heath-Brown, D. R., and B. Z. Moroz, On the representation of primes by cubic polynomials in two variables, *Proc. London Math. Soc. (3)* **88** (2004), 289–312.

[18] Helfgott, H. A., On the square-free sieve, *Acta Arith.* **115** (2004), 349–402.

[19] Helfgott, H. A., The parity problem for irreducible cubic forms, submitted.

[20] Helfgott, H. A., The parity problem for reducible cubic forms, *J. London Math. Soc.* **73**, no. 2 (2006), 415–435.

[21] Kisin, M., Local constancy in p–adic families of Galois representations, *Math. Z.* **230** (1999), 569–593.

[22] Kobayashi, S., The local root number of elliptic curves with wild ramification, *Math. Ann.* **323** (2002), 609–623.

[23] Manduchi, E., Root numbers of fibers of elliptic surfaces, *Compositio Math.* **99** (1995), 33–58.

[24] Miller, S. J., One- and two-level densities for rational families of elliptic curves: evidence for the underlying group symmetries, *Compositio Math.* **140** (2004), 952–992.

[25] Neukirch, J., Algebraic number theory, Springer–Verlag, Berlin, 1999.

[26] Poonen, B., Square-free values of multivariable polynomials, *Duke Math. J.* **118** (2003), 353–373.

[27] Ramsay, K., Square-free values of polynomials in one variable over function fields, *Internat. Math. Res. Notices* **1992**, 97–102.

[28] Rizzo, O. G., Average root numbers in families of elliptic curves, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **127** (1999), 1597–1603.

[29] Rizzo, O. G., Average root numbers for a non-constant family of elliptic curves, *Compositio Math.* **136** (2003), 1–23.

[30] Rohrlich, D. E., Variation of the root number in families of elliptic curves, *Compositio Math.* **87** (1993), 119–151.

[31] Rohrlich, D. E., Elliptic curves and the Weil-Deligne group, *Elliptic curves and related topics*, 125–157, *CRM Proc. Lecture Notes* **4** AMS, Providence, RI, 1994.

[32] Rohrlich, D. E., Galois theory, elliptic curves, and root numbers, *Compositio Math.* **100** (1996), 311–349.

[33] Rohrlich, D. E., personal communication.

[34] Serre, J.-P., and J. Tate, Good reduction of abelian varieties, *Ann. of Math. (2)* **88** (1968), 492–517.

[35] Silverman, J. H., Heights and the specialization map for families of abelian varieties, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **342** (1983), 197–211.

[36] Silverman, J. H., *The arithmetic of elliptic curves*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1985.

[37] Wong, S., On the density of elliptic curves, *Compositio Math.* **127** (2001), 23–54.

[38] Young, M., Low-lying zeroes of families of elliptic curves, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **19** (2006), 205–250.

[39] Young, M., Lower-order terms of the 1-level density of families of elliptic curves, *Int. Math. Res. Not.* **2004**, 587–633.

Mathematics Department, University of Bristol, Bristol BS8 1TW, United Kingdom
E-mail address: `h.andres.helfgott@bristol.ac.uk`